The Great Sacrilege

Fr. James F. Wathen

The James F. Wathen
Traditional Catholic Foundation

MMXI

Copyright © 2011 The James F. Wathen
Traditional Catholic Foundation

Permission given to http://cathinfo.com
for distribution of this PDF for personal use of the users
therein only. Any other distribution prohibited.

(ISBN: 0-9833561-0-3)

The James F. Wathen
Traditional Catholic Foundation
P.O. Box 9393
Louisville, KY, 40209

www.FatherWathen.com

CONTENTS

Chapter One: Introduction.....1

Chapter Two: Papal Infallibility.....7

A. Papal Authority.....9
B. Papal Infallibility.....14

Chapter Three: The Great Sacrilege.....25

A. The Holy Mass.....25
B. The Council of Trent and the True Mass.....31
C. Pope St. Pius V, Quo Primum, and the True Mass...33
D. The Act.....45
E. Pope Paul VI's Defense 59
F. The "Authentic Tradition".....66
G. The Roman Rite and Antiquarianism.....72

Chapter Four: The "New Mass" of Baal.....79

A. Expurgations 82
B. Mistranslations.....89
C. The Changing of the Canon.....96
D. The new form of Consecration.....101
1. The Epiclesis and Form of Consecration.....105
2. "Mysterium Fidei".....110
3. "Haec quotiescumque".....115
4. "Pro Multis".....118
E. Validity and Liceity.....125
F. The Dishonoring of Mary.....139
G. The Purpose of Archaism 141
H. The Rite of Peace.....143
I. The "Communion" 156
J. "Ecumenism" 159
K. The Language of the "New Mass".....166

Chapter Five: Apostolic Constitution,
Missale Romanum, of Pope Paul VI.....171

Chapter Six: The Burden.....187

A. PRIESTS.....189
B. THE PEOPLE.....196

Chapter Seven: Challenge.....211

Chapter Eight: Conclusion.....227

Appendix I: *Quo Primum*.....229

Appendix II: *Missale Romanum*.....235

Appendix III: *Profession of the Catholic Faith*
Taken by all Priests at Ordination.....243

To Pope Saint Pius V

Guardian of the True Mass

Editor's Preface

It has been forty years—a biblically significant forty years—since Fr. James Wathen's earth-shattering analysis of the New Mass first went to print. During this time we Catholics have witnessed many things, both with regard to the rough and unpastoral manner of the *Novus Ordo Missae's* implementation, and the outright persecution and "excommunication" of those who would remain faithful to it, the Faith, and their Oath Against Modernism.

Recently, however, we have seen certain apparent concessions granted by the hierarchy to those of us who are "attached" to the ancient Mass; these concessions include Pope Benedict XVI's 2007 *Motu Proprio Summorum Pontificum*, as well as a newly translated vernacular version of the *Novus Ordo*. Many Catholics, undoubtedly, are overjoyed that someone in Rome appears to be "listening" to our voices, voices crying in this ecclesiastical wilderness these past four decades. While these "changes" and apparent victories serve to thrill many Catholics, and are perhaps even disarming to some, readers of this work (a work written at the very advent of the *Novus Ordo*) will not be so quick to celebrate.

The apparent concession of Pope Benedict XVI's *Motu Proprio* that the True Mass has never been abrogated, and that

any priest can say it (under certain circumstances), has indeed been a cause of great joy among many Catholics. However, so few seem to recognize (or perhaps refuse to discuss) the fact that in the *Motu Proprio* and the accompanying letter, the Pontiff states emphatically that the New Mass is just as much a proper profession of the Catholic Faith as the Old, and that they are to be held by Catholics as "equal".

The second great "concession" which has many Catholics' attention is the recent re-translation of the *Novus Ordo* into the vernacular. It appears that, after forty years of liturgical dreaming, someone suddenly woke up and realized that the English translation of the New Mass was so poorly executed (either by intention or incompetence—either one of which should have disqualified the translators), that a nearly ten year endeavor to "fix" these mistakes must be undertaken. It is ironic that "conservative" Catholics judge these changes to be good insofar as it causes the New Mass to more resemble the True Mass. In other words, whether they admit it or not, the True Catholic Mass is, by default, the benchmark of Orthodoxy and true, fitting Divine Worship.

Regardless of what appears to be good in these recent changes, faithful Catholics everywhere recognize that, until the Pope reissues *Quo Primum*, and affixes his hand and seal to it, nothing has really changed in the world of the Conciliar Church.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

After many days the word of the Lord came to Elias, in the third year, saying: Go and shew thyself to Achab, that I may give rain upon the face of the earth.

And Elias went to shew himself to Achab, And there was a great famine in Samaria.

3 Kings 18:1–2

Even though most Catholics—including the hierarchy and other members of the clergy—are either complacently ignorant of it, or are determined to ignore it, sooner or later the question of the "New Mass" will have to be dealt with. The presumption at present seems to be that, with time, those who oppose and/or reject it, and those priests who refuse to "say" the "New Mass," will finally come around, die off, or something. The "something" is that they will be joined by an ever-growing number whom God will raise up, if necessary, out of the stones (Luke 3:18). This question is so basic to the Faith, that the Church cannot survive without its being answered. But, since the Church will surely survive, with or without the loyalty of any individual, it is those who do not face up to it who will die off sooner; the question itself will remain.

The question put simply is: *Why the "New Mass"?* Coincident with it, in fact, the same question put in another way is: *What then is the situation with regard to the Traditional*

Latin Mass, the "Tridentine Mass," or the "Mass of St. Pius V," as it has come to be called?

Until this question is *seriously* considered by those who have the authority to influence the Church at large, those others who are concerned enough to realize the essential importance of it and the profound spiritual suffering, confusion, and strife which it has caused may be assisted by the argument of this little book. It is written mainly with priests in mind because it is they who offer the Holy Mass, and it is upon them whom Christ Our Lord relies to provide the Holy Sacrifice for the people whom His Blood has redeemed. But, it is intended also as guidance for lay people. I know well how inexplicable the changes in the Mass are to most of them, and how they look for direction as to what they must do (if anything) about these changes.

The prevalent opinion is that, by his Apostolic Constitution *Missale Romanum* of April 3, 1969, His Holiness Pope Paul VI established the *Novus Ordo Missae* to replace the Traditional Latin Mass of the Roman Rite (and all intermediate versions). Consequently, to refuse to offer this "New Mass" is a serious violation of Church law. And to question it on doctrinal grounds is tantamount to questioning the doctrine of papal infallibility.

Every aspect of this opinion, however, is totally contrary to fact. *There is no law which so binds the clergy. And to challenge the liceity and/or the validity and/or the orthodoxy of the "New Mass" is in no way to question the aforementioned doctrine of papal infallibility.*

And for the reason that there is no such law (which we shall prove in this work), those who have accepted the "New Mass" and discontinued saying the True Mass are breaking the existing laws, as are found in the Code of Canon Law [1913]; they are violating their sacred priestly oath, the *Profession of Faith* (not to mention the *Oath Against Modernism*). It is they

who have incurred the anathemas of the Council of Trent and come under the censure of the Apostolic Constitution *Quo Primum* of St. Pius V. And it is they who are playing heretics by their effective denial of all those doctrines of the Faith which are given utterance in the "Tridentine Mass," but which have been deliberately and undeniably deleted in the "new formulation" of the Mass. It is they who, in the "New Mass," are making their own all the heterodox ambiguities with which it abounds. It is they who have accepted the corruptions of the sacred Canon of the Mass, as well as the very possibly invalidating new version of the Consecration Prayer, introduced entirely gratuitously. This is true even if they still use the Latin, which few priests do. But their case becomes infinitely more tenuous with the use of the vernacular, which is known to be a garbled translation.

That so many morally upright, anointed men of God—by far, the vast majority throughout the world—could have been so easily brought to abandon their Mass, so venerable and so pure, and prostitute their personal faith, was not due to some strange and sinister hypnotic power, nor to their lack of theological knowledge, nor to the dreadful threats of a ruthless government. No, it was due to the Act by which Pope Paul VI introduced the "New Mass" with the "*wish*" that it be accepted, "as an instrument which bears witness to and which affirms the common unity of all."[1]

In this writing I intend to refute that main argument which was used to seduce and/or to goad priests into their practical apostasy, which is, that not to accept the "New Mass" at least borders on heresy, since it is to accuse the pope of heresy, and thus, to deny his infallibility. For, the argument goes, to maintain that the Holy Father could issue a false mass, or one which might

[1] Apostolic Constitution *Missale Romanum* of Pope Paul VI, Par. 13; Given here as Appendix II.

be invalid, or one which contains heresy, is most certainly the same as saying that he has violated his sacred prerogative of infallibility. Besides this, to refuse to have anything to do with the "New Mass" is a most serious act of disobedience, highly suggestive of contumely.

In this writing, the doctrine of papal infallibility will be discussed first, mainly in order to show that in issuing the "New Mass" *Pope Paul VI did not make an "ex cathedra" definition.* Conversely, we shall point out the various ways the pope can be *fallible*, and we shall remind Catholics what their responsibility is if errors of the pope jeopardize either their faith or their virtue.

This discussion will clear the ground for the main topic of the essay, which is the study of the so-called "New Mass." We shall begin by comparing the "New Mass" with the "Traditional" Catholic Mass, of which the former is said to be only a new version. First, we shall remind the reader of the place of the Holy Mass in the faith of all Catholics, then we shall refer to the Council of Trent and its teachings concerning the Holy Sacrifice. Next, we shall take note of the work of Pope St. Pius V in his revision of the Missal of the Roman Rite. This will bring us to a careful look at that Pope's decree, *Quo Primum*, which imposed the *Missale Romanum*, the "old" Missal.

Only after all the foregoing shall we analyze the issuance of the *Novus Ordo Missae*, then take a long, hard look at the "New Mass" itself. We shall give special attention to the changes which have been made in the Form of Consecration. We shall come eventually to an investigation of Pope Paul's Apostolic Constitution, *Missale Romanum*, for the sake of determining its binding force. (The reader should make a mental note of the fact that both Pope St. Pius V's *Missal* and Pope Paul VI's "decree" introducing his "Missal" have the same

title, i.e., *Missale Romanum*; we shall indicate carefully which we are referring to when we use the term.)

On the basis of our findings, it will be necessary to state unequivocally the inescapable moral challenge with which all those who love the Faith are now confronted. Lastly, as I am aware of the momentousness of the conclusions set forth in these pages, I shall offer all priests an opportunity to refute them.

CHAPTER TWO

Papal Infallibility

> But, let everyone understand well that nothing has been changed in the essence of our traditional Mass. Some perhaps will have gotten the idea that by the introduction of such and such a ceremony, or such and such a rubric being added, that such things constitute or hide alterations or minimisations of defined truths or ideas sanctioned by the Catholic Faith… But there is nothing to this idea, absolutely. First of all, because ritual and rubrics are not in themselves a matter of dogmatic definition.[2]

Thus, His Holiness says that there is nothing essentially new in the "New Mass," that the changes are only "ritual," and therefore not subject to a "*de fide* pronouncement." On the basis of this statement alone, there seems to be no further need to mention papal infallibility with regard to the "New Mass," and we may move on to the next phase of the argument.

It is not so simple as that, however, though it really ought to be, for the obvious reason that *most priests act as if they think that the issuance of the "Novus Ordo" obligates them in the same way as they are obligated to the most solemn definitions of the Church*, if not more so, and they have led most of the faithful to believe the

[2] Allocution of Pope Paul VI on November 19, 1969 *La Documentation Catholique;* 7 December 1969, No. 1552.

same thing. I cannot say it was ever preached *explicitly* that, if one does not accept Pope Paul's "New Mass," he is a heretic and monstrously disobedient. However, that inference was implanted, generally and firmly, throughout the world. An open debate was never allowed. Regardless, at least for now, of how the idea became so ineffaceably fixed, the clergy generally imagine it highly virtuous to yield on this matter to their superiors (all the way up to the pope), and trust that, eventually, God will make everything all right. (Whether they believe this in their heart of hearts I would not be able to say.)

We are safe in saying that Catholics believe the doctrine of papal infallibility, even though they do not know what it means. Or perhaps it would be better to say, they believe it, but do not know how it applies. For this reason, I feel I must prepare the ground for my main argument by laying to rest this infallibility bugbear.

In order to focus on the subject, the first thing necessary is to recall the familiar distinction between papal authority and papal infallibility. There is nothing abstruse in this, but it must not be forgotten.

As Cardinal Journet points out, both papal authority and papal infallibility are included in the pope's supreme and all-inclusive jurisdictional power.[3] Whereas the Supreme Pontiff's authority is co-extensive with his jurisdiction, his infallibility is not. In fact, papal infallibility covers a most rigidly and specifically circumscribed area, the most narrowly-defined, I might add, of all the areas of his sovereignty.

[3] *The Church of the Word Incarnate*. Charles Journet, Sheed and Ward, London, 1955 Vol. 1 pp. 156–157.

A. Papal Authority

> The Roman pontiff, the successor of Blessed Peter in primacy, has not only the primacy of honor, but also supreme and plenary power of jurisdiction throughout the universal Church, both in matters which pertain to faith and morals, but also in those which have to do with the discipline and order of the Church.
>
> This power is truly episcopal, ordinary and direct, both over all and each of the churches of Christendom, over all and each of the pastors and faithful, and independent of all human authority whatsoever.[4]

This is to say that all Catholics, from cardinals to newly-baptized converts, are bound to obey the Holy Father in all *religious matters, except a command to do something sinful.*[5] There is no suggestion in the law quoted above that the pope is infallible in the exercise of this plenipotentiary *authority.* Nor is there anything in Divine Revelation or ecclesiastical law which guarantees that the pope will never make an unwise law, or repeal a wise one; appoint an inept bishop, or a bad one; impose an unjust interdiction, or refuse to impose a necessary one; teach erroneous notions (even rank heresy) and say and do things which lead to mistaken conclusions, or permit his subordinates to do so. Nothing—except Divine Providence, if He so chooses—prevents there being a totally incompetent, or imprudent, or immoral pope. Indeed, forbidding as such a thought may be, it is not inconceivable (i.e., out of the realm

[4] *Codex Iuris Canonici.* Newman Press, Westminster, Maryland, 1954. Canon 218, Paragraphs 1 & 2.

[5] If there is no point of religion involved, we would not be bound to obey a command which was *not sinful*, as for instance, a command to vote for a certain person. However, for a religious reason, we might be commanded *not* to vote for someone.

of possibility, or, the same thing, contradictory to the doctrine here under discussion) that there ascend the Throne of St. Peter a malicious pope, one bent on the total destruction of the Church, he being faithless enough to think such a thing possible! That even such a one, with such unrestricted and unrestrictable power, with all the help of his similarly-minded appointees, would be unable to succeed in such an effort is guaranteed by the doctrine of the Church's Indefectibility. And the reason even such a one would not be able to succeed *is*, in fact, papal infallibility itself, as we shall see a little later.

There is, at the same time, nothing in the definition of the Papacy which guarantees that the Supreme Pontiff could not give sinful commands and permit, or even encourage, the gravest abuses, or raise wicked and conspiratorial men to the episcopacy and the cardinalate, to give them free reign to teach every kind of error and command or permit every kind of misdeed. In a word, there is no divine promise that the pope will not be permitted to use his great authority in the most wicked and destructive ways.

Such a pope would not, despite any and all manner of unholy action, lose his own legitimacy, nor his all-comprehensive jurisdiction, nor the divine prerogative of infallibility; so that, should an avowed conspirator become the Roman pontiff, were he converted, he might immediately set about repairing the damage he himself had helped to inflict on the Church, without needing to be re-elected and re-instated or re-confirmed in his office; only his private confession and absolution from any censure he might have incurred would be required.[6]

[6] The widespread notion that anyone who incurs "*ipso facto* excommunication" is thereby out of the Church (i.e., no longer a member) and therefore loses all ecclesiastical office, dignities, etc., is based on a fundamental misconception. "Once a Catholic, always a Catholic" is a valid principle. "*Anathema sit*" does not mean that

Cardinal Journet explains that the Church cannot depose a pope, no matter how wicked he may be because there is no authority above the Papacy. God Himself must do it.[7] If he is a heretic, the Church can declare him "worthy of deposition."

> The Church's action is simply declaratory; it makes the fact plain that an incorrigible sin of heresy exists; then the authoritive action of God disjoins the Papacy from a subject who, persisting in heresy after admonition, becomes in divine law, inapt to retain it any longer.[8]

These words do not mean that the Church, i.e., the bishops in council, have the power to deprive even an heretical pope of his office and jurisdiction. They mean that the Church may use every moral means to force his abdication or prevent his acts from causing too great confusion and scandal. The defenders of the Faith in such a case would have to urge the people to pray, either for the pontiff's conversion or for his direct removal by God, while they warned the people that his teachings were pernicious. From all this it can be seen that an individual Catholic or group of Catholics cannot decide that the pope is "worthy of deposition," let alone already deposed.

Obviously then, there is no imagining what a terrible source of scandal either a morally bad or a doctrinally careless pope can be to how many millions of souls. Nor is there any way of

---

the Church thereby excludes a person altogether; but the subject may not participate in the life of the Church, that is, receive any of the sacraments of the living, or participate in liturgical ceremonies, take part in Church functions, etc. As regards any offices, they are lost through a canonical condemnation only. Loss of an ecclesiastical office occurs immediately upon a declaration of "*excommunicatus vitandus*" ("excommunicated and to be avoided") by the pope himself. Obviously the supreme pontiff cannot incur this censure. (Cf. Codes "*Iuris Canonici*". Nos. 2256–67.)

[7] Journet. Op. cit., Vol 1 pp. 425–26

[8] Ibid. p. 484

describing the satanic glee in the camp of the Church's inveterate enemies should they ever be able to infiltrate one of their own into his position, or subvert or subdue the Supreme Roman Pontiff to their service.

The doctrine of papal infallibility, by stating in what respect the pope cannot err, admits, in effect, that in all other areas of his vast prerogatives the pope is completely fallible. And since this papal *fallibility* is as certain a fact as the holy doctrine which we are here discussing, Catholics must be convinced of the following most important principle, a principle which has a special relevance in the context of this present writing. It is this: No matter what may happen, since *no one* may justifiably command another to sin, and since *no one* is permitted to obey such a command, *no one* may ever blame another—*even an errant pope*—for his sins. Conversely, the failure of *any person—even the pope*—to keep God's law or to preserve his own faith, does not excuse any other person for his failure to do the same. *Ignorance of the law or ignorance of the Faith is never an excuse for sinning; one is bound to know when he is being commanded to sin.* The notion is abroad that one may always simply follow the pope and the bishops and thus be sure of salvation. *Ordinarily* this is a reliable norm. However, it is so only because *ordinarily* the pope and the bishops are more zealous for and more perfectly instructed in the Faith than their subjects.

Neither can anyone get permission to sin through the erroneous teaching of the pope or any of his other spiritual superiors, nor through their failure to teach what they ought. Everyone is bound to keep God's law and the Faith. The obligation to do that which is good and avoid that which is evil and to believe the truths of Catholicism does not arise from the hierarchy of the Church, nor from the

Papacy, *but from the intrinsic nature of things and the commands of Christ, Who is Lord of all*.[9]

When religious superiors officially and explicitly propound and explain our moral obligations and the truths of the Gospel, we are thereby both personally and collectively assisted. It is the right and grave duty of said superiors to do this, and also to see that we fulfill them besides; that is what their jurisdiction is for. But whether they do so or not in no way alters our relationship to God, from whom ultimately our duty derives.

And, lest the point be missed, just as we must perform our duties, whether or not we are commanded and compelled to do so by those whom God has charged with the task, likewise, we must perform our duties should we be commanded *not* to do them, or to do something wrong instead. In the Church, no individual is *the* standard of perfect virtue or purity of doctrine —only Christ Our Lord.

And, lest anyone think these things are spoken lightly, let him reflect: it is a true saying that *if anyone denies so much as one doctrine of the Faith, he is, morally speaking, denying it completely*. And if he denies his Faith, he will lose his soul. Even if he denies his Faith *implicitly*, though knowingly, he is still denying it, none the less. If we may not disavow the revealed teachings of Christ at the command of a pagan government, neither may we do so if our religious superiors command it. "But he that shall deny Me before men, I will also deny him before My Father Who is in Heaven" (Matthew 10:33).

No more does the great holiness and shining orthodoxy or the faultless rule of one pontiff assure any Catholic of his salvation than does the wickedness of another pope cause

[9] The principle is given no notice at all by those who reject the teaching of Pope Paul VI on contraception and/or that of Pope Pius XII on rhythm, on the ground that the specific papal statements on these moral questions were not *ex cathedra* definitions.

anyone's perdition. *The papacy is not a sacrament!* Nor is the personal faith of any one pope the touchstone of Orthodoxy; rather, it is the solemnly defined doctrines of the Church and all those teachings and norms which flow logically from them. It is the traditional Faith of Catholicism we must adhere to—the Faith of the Saints—no matter what happens during any given period of the Church's history.

B. Papal Infallibility

The infallibility of the Sovereign Pontiff is one of the major doctrinal developments of Catholic Theology over the course of the centuries. This development is understood to have reached its highest formal expression at the First Vatican Council with the promulgation of the dogmatic constitution, *Pastor Aeternus*, by Pope Pius IX on July 18, 1870.

Catholics should exult in the holiness and greatness of this doctrine. It was made during an age when their forefathers were not ashamed of the Church, and with that boldness with which Divine Truth should always be proclaimed. It is now one of the glories of the Faith, and should be the source of great consolation and encouragement both in view of the history of the Church and of the present trouble-ridden era. For truly, those will be saved who strictly adhere to the definite and certain teachings of the popes, without letting themselves be diverted by the assorted and fanciful inanities which Catholics are forced to listen to these days, even from their pulpits, and, not infrequently, from some of the prelates of the Church. Let these Catholics be reminded that, no matter from what source it comes, *every idea must be perfectly and clearly reconcilable with the Faith of their forefathers, or their assent to it should be withheld, if not forthrightly refused*. Catholics can be at

peace in the certainty that nothing has happened, or will ever happen, which will render anachronistic, or out-dated, the sacred truths of their childhood catechism, since, as they know very well, it is the antiquity of Catholicism which is a sign of its veracity and one of its proudest boasts. Another name for this is "Apostolicity."

An *ex cathedra* definition is always the canonization of an Apostolic tradition. When the pope defines a doctrine, thus exercising his infallibility, he is doing nothing more than making explicitly definite, and clear, a divine truth, holy in its essence, a truth which has been held—you might say, "taken for granted"—by the faithful, from the beginning. He is only making *explicit* for the future what was *implicit* in the past, implicit in the teaching of the Apostles themselves.

Above all, no Catholic need fear the pope will ever violate his infallibility; it is *de fide* ("of the Faith") that God will never permit it. God may permit any other kind of abuse of papal authority except this. The Church itself will sooner cease to be: "And behold I am with you all days even unto the consummation of the world" (Matthew 28:20). The very existence of the Church depends on this never happening.

That the pope be infallible is absolutely necessary for the survival of the Church, since it is from the papacy itself that the Church's own infallibility flows. This is the true meaning of Our Divine Savior's words to St. Peter:

> *Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have you that he may sift you as wheat:*
>
> *But I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not; and thou, being once converted, confirm thy brethren.*
>
> Luke 22:31–32

The Church, as the source and cause of salvation, stands on the papacy as a building stands on its foundation. Its

imperishability derives from the papacy, from the infallibility of the papacy. This can be easily seen: the Church must never err in those very matters which men are commanded by Christ to believe and do, if they are to possess life everlasting. I know, a common notion has it that God in His mercy will save every man who has "good will." But that is not Catholic theology. The truth is, God will save those who *acknowledge* the sovereign authority of the Roman pontiffs, *believe* what the pontiffs say, and *do* as they command. As He is the God of truth, men must *know* that the Church (and therefore the pope), speaks His truth, always, so that they may put their utter faith in it. It stands to reason that, should the pope, as the chief spokesman of the Church, ever teach as true what men with or without the gift of Faith can clearly see is false, it would be "all over!" In such a case, by that very act, the Church would have been wounded fatally, for ever after, and the world would be without the only magisterium of Revealed Truth there is. Even all its former true statements would at the same time come into question, and it could defend none of them. And there would follow that dissension and fragmentation which has been the history of Protestantism from its inception—only more so. Would the Builder of the Universe, the Carpenter of Nazareth, put His house on sand? "And the rain fell, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and they beat upon that house, and it fell, and great was the fall thereof" (Matthew 7:27). He Who said these words knew something about building.

At the First Vatican Council, the fathers labored tediously to formulate exactly the statement of the doctrine of papal infallibility. Their effort was so to circumscribe the idea that only such immunity from error would be claimed for the papacy as men must believe in for salvation, and as their own faith would recognize as true. It is imperative for a Catholic

that his knowledge of this doctrine be identical with the truth of it. *Therefore, our notion of infallibility should include only what we are required to believe and nothing else.*

Let us then carefully attend to the wording of the definition of the term "papal infallibility":

> The Roman pontiff, when he speaks *ex cathedra*—that is, when in the exercise of his office as pastor and teacher of all Christians, he defines, by virtue of his supreme Apostolic authority, a doctrine of faith or morals to be held by the whole Church—is, by reason of the Divine assistance promised to him in blessed Peter, possessed of that infallibility which the Divine Redeemer wished His Church to be endowed in defining doctrines of faith and morals; and consequently that such definitions of the Roman pontiff are irreformable of their own nature and not by reason of the Church's consent.[10]

In explaining this definition, the *Catholic Encyclopedia* says:

> The conditions required for *ex cathedra* teaching are mentioned in the Vatican decree:
>
> *[a]* The pontiff must teach in his public and official capacity as pastor and doctor of all Christians, not merely in his private capacity as a theologian, preacher or allocutionist, nor in his capacity as a temporal prince or as a mere ordinary of the Diocese of Rome. It must be clear that he speaks as spiritual head of the Universal Church.
>
> *[b]* Then it is only when, in this capacity, he teaches some doctrine of faith or morals that he is infallible.

[10] "Infallibility" *The Catholic Encyclopedia;* Robert Appleton Company, New York, 1910. Vol 7, p 796, col. 1.

> *[c]* Further, it must be sufficiently evident that he intends to teach with all the fullness and finality of his supreme Apostolic authority, in other words, that he wishes to determine some point of doctrine in an absolutely final and irrevocable way, or to define it in the technical sense…
>
> *[d]* Finally, for an *ex cathedra* decision, it must be clear that the pope intends to bind the whole Church, to demand internal assent from all the faithful to his teaching under pain of incurring internal shipwreck (*naufragium fidei*), according to the expression used by Pius IX in defining the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin.[10]

Let us expand upon the meaning of this quotation.

1. Papal infallibility can be said to be exercised *only when the pope teaches the Universal Church a truth of the Faith*. By his pronouncement, he necessarily silences, concludes, and bans any further contrary argument on the particular subject, which, until then, had been a debatable question, theologically speaking. It amounts to his saying: Of all the things we do not know, this we do; and you can base further speculations on this without fear of error. Any effort you make to disprove this teaching will prove futile and a waste of your time. It will be sinful besides, for it will be challenging Divine Truth. Only as much has been defined as is certainly known; theologians and mystics may go on from here.

2. Further, not only are you not allowed to argue the point, but you are bound to believe it. God commands you to do so. And to refuse is to assail His veracity. You are not free to remain indifferent or agnostic about the matter, or to refrain from giving your assent to it. Not to believe and profess it is to deny it. By this *ex cathedra* definition, the traditional belief has

been confirmed as a dogma of faith, as certainly and unalterably true as all other dogmas of the True Religion.

3. No matter how verbose or scientific its phrasing, once all the terms are defined, a papal decision can always be expressed in a simple declarative sentence. It can be one of two kinds of statements: a dogmatic truth—Mary was conceived Immaculate; The Blessed Eucharist is the Body of Christ; The pope is infallible—or a moral prohibition—abortion is a mortal sin; contraception is a mortal sin; betrayal of one's country is a mortal sin.

4. An infallible definition is made when the teaching Church arrives at the conclusion that God requires all men to believe the particular truth defined. He has revealed this truth because men need to know it. If it is a doctrine, they should believe it primarily because it is a manifestation of His glory, power and love, a disclosure of Himself and His ways. If the revelation is a moral prohibition, it is a warning that the act is wicked in itself and to commit it is to attack directly the goodness and sovereignty of the Revealer and to bring death to one's soul.

5. An *ex cathedra* definition is addressed to all the members of the Universal Church, regardless of which of the several Rites (into which it is divided canonically and liturgically) they belong to. *Ex cathedra* definitions are a matter of spiritual life and death, of salvation or perdition. They are more important than temporal affairs, social problems, or earthly love. They involve every man with God. Man's disinterest in them is the vice of sloth. They are eternal and holy, regardless of who is pope or who is king. Every man must himself discover *why* they are important to him; they are what his mind is for—truths to be discerned by his intellect for the salvation of his soul.

That is not to say that dogmatic and moral truths are irrelevant to the world and the problems of human life. The world needs nothing more direly than infallible, supernatural truth. The pope could not do the world more good than by letting it hear his voice, authoritative, certain, commanding, and teaching. The world needs no alternatives of palliatives to Catholicism in all its fullness. Because men have dared to discard divinely revealed truth, they have gotten themselves into their present woeful predicament. Now they are at the mercy of the "agitation-propaganda" (or "agit-prop") of the world-engulfing Revolution, of which, as we shall see later, the so-called "New Mass" is a product and a tool, and, to my knowledge, one of its greatest triumphs.

6. The question may be asked: But suppose a certain pope *did* make a clearly false *ex cathedra* definition? The idea of papal infallibility makes such an hypothesis a contradiction in terms. The doctrine means that God Himself, Who knows the most secret thoughts of men, would prevent such a thing from happening, either directly or through His ordinary overmastery of all creatural actions. As a matter of fact, who can say that God has not thus intervened in the past? So susceptible are all human beings to error, sin, and temptation, that we may easily imagine that He has found it necessary to do so, unbeknown though it may have been.

These considerations should help the reader see the distinction between a papal *ex cathedra* definition and an act by which the pope may legislate concerning the Holy Mass. The former is a *statement* by which the pope teaches a truth which is a part of the "Deposit of Faith." The latter is an *act* by which the pope employs his jurisdiction for pastoral discipline. In the former case, he is protected from error by the Holy Ghost Himself; in the latter, he is completely capable of making poor or imprudent decisions. And, if he be malicious, if he would

dare so tempt God, and if he thinks he can get away with it, he may even, conceivably, attempt some deliberate perversion.

Even though the prayers of the Mass contain affirmations of faith, these prayers are not in themselves *ex cathedra* proclamations. The Church does teach her children the doctrines of the Faith by embodying these doctrines in her liturgical prayers—a better word would be *familiarize*. However, the main purpose of the prayers is not to teach, any more than the main purpose of any prayer is to teach, but to worship and communicate with God. The liturgy does not define the truths of the Faith; it assents to them, meditates on them, glories in them, and thanks God for revealing them. How utterly disorderly and intolerable, therefore, would it be if the communal prayer of the people contained the least ambiguity, inaccuracy, or unfamiliar teaching, or lacked perfect clarity, doctrinal precision, or beauty of expression! For it to contain anything that savored of positive error or falsity or propaganda or mistranslation would be something too horrendous to imagine or to describe!

The legislation of the Church on liturgical matters, and particularly the Holy Mass, falls under the heading of discipline or legislation, rather than under teaching or doctrine. When Pope St. Pius V finalized the ritual of the Mass of the Latin Rite, he was not defining the truths expressed in its prayers. He was passing a law forbidding anyone to alter these prayers because these prayers suitably expressed the major doctrines which had been defined by the Council of Trent.

This is why the Mass of the Roman Rite was bound to be referred to as the "Tridentine Mass," even though all the prayers predate that Council by centuries. Indeed it was from these prayers that the Council fathers had learned the teaching which they defined. The Mass, as it is found in the other rites of the Church, could never be called "Tridentine." The reason

is, though the prayers of these liturgies are doctrinally pure and unquestionably Catholic, their emphasis and mentality and mode of expression are not so intimately related to, or so interdependent with, the decrees of the Council of Trent as are the prayers of the Mass of the Latin Rite.

From all the above, it is quite clear that Pope Paul VI's imposition of the "New Mass" is in no sense of the word an act of his infallible teaching authority. It must be assessed as a pastoral act, one which pertains to the discipline and practice of the Roman Rite. Once this point is clearly understood, we are free to draw the following conclusions:

1. In issuing the "*Novus Ordo*," Pope Paul was using his legitimate authority. But, we are permitted to discuss whether he was *abusing* his authority in doing so. Moreover we are *compelled* to do so in view of what the "New Mass" is!

2. Since there is no question of papal infallibility involved, it is not at all out of order to question either the morality, the liceity, the validity, the orthodoxy, the nature, the purpose (given or real), the wisdom, or any other aspect of the "New Mass."

All the foregoing has been thought necessary because of the *aura of untouchability* which surrounds the subject of the "New Mass." Not a little of this mentality was deliberately created, as I will have occasion to point out again further on. For the present, if we are agreed that the subject is *permissible* and open to discussion, we will begin.

Necessarily, all the aspects listed above will receive consideration in the following pages; not specifically, however, but by way of inclusion. *The main emphasis here will be on the morality of that Act by which Pope Paul introduced and imposed his "Mass,"* a subject which, strangely, seems to have been raised by only a few *lay people*. Almost all discussion, sparse as it has been in view of the seriousness of the subject, has centered around either the *legality* of this Act or the *validity* of the

Consecration of the wine, due to the obvious mistranslation of the Consecration Form. I am forced to say, however, that their discussion has taken too much attention from the larger and more obvious question, namely, how the "New Mass" contradicts the will of God. The explanation for this gross oversight, the almost entire failure to examine the "New Mass" and the morality of its imposition, is the legalism to which Catholics of the Latin Rite are so prone, and for which our enemies have often justly found fault with us. Thus, those who have accepted the "New Mass," whether gladly or reluctantly, have done so under the mistaken notion that its introduction was legal, or at least apparently so, and therefore, its acceptance was both permissible and necessary. Most of those who have made an effort to resist the final and complete imposition of the "New Mass" have directed their fire against the technical flaws in its makeup (real as they are) and at the illegal mode of its imposition, rather than at the morality of the Pope's Act, as we shall do here.

Chapter Three

The Great Sacrilege

A. The Holy Mass

Before going further, I ask you to remind yourself what is at stake: the most Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. Recall that God has given us nothing more perfect or tremendous, of which the Council of Trent said:

> Our God and Lord, though He was by His death about to offer Himself once upon the altar of the Cross to God the Father that He might there accomplish an eternal redemption, nevertheless, that His Priesthood might not come to an end with His death, at the Last Supper, on the night He was betrayed, that He might leave to His beloved spouse, the Church, a visible sacrifice, such as the nature of man requires, whereby that bloody sacrifice once to be accomplished on the Cross might be represented, the memory thereof remain even to the end of the world, and its salutary effects applied to the remission of those sins which we daily commit, declaring Himself constituted a priest forever according to the order of Melchisedech, offered up to God the Father His own Body and Blood under the form of bread and wine, and under the forms of those same things gave to the Apostles, Whom He then

> made priests of the New Testament, that they might partake, commanding them and their successors in the priesthood by these words to do likewise: "Do this in commemoration of Me," as the Catholic Church has always understood and taught.[11]

Of the Mass, the marvelous St. Leonard of Port Maurice said:

> The sole sacrifice which we have in our holy religion, that is to say, Holy Mass, is a sacrifice, holy, perfect, in every point complete, with which each one of the faithful nobly honors God, protesting at one and the same time his own nothingness and the supreme dominion which God hath over him; a sacrifice called, therefore, by David, *sacrificium justitiae*, "the sacrifice of justice" (Psalm 4:5); both because it contains the Just One Himself, and the Saint of saints, or rather, justice and holiness themselves, and because it sanctifies souls by the infusion of grace and the affluence of gifts which it confers. Being, then, a sacrifice so holy—a sacrifice the most venerable and the most excellent of all—in order that you may form a due conception of so great a treasure, we shall here explain, in the manner quite succinct, some of its excellencies. To express them all were not a work to which our poor faculties could attain.[12]

Calling attention to the central necessity of the Mass in our lives, the great Father Fahey wrote:

> The great need of our generation, as of every generation since Calvary, is the living of the Life of the

[11] Cc. Trid. Sess. XXII, Cap. I. Quoted in *The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass* Rev. Dr. Nicholas Gihr. B. Herder Book Co. St. Louis. 1949. pp. 94–95.

[12] *The Hidden Treasure,* St. Leonard of Port Maurice. TAN books and Publishers, Rockford, Illinois. 1971 pp. 21–22.

Mystical Body of Our Lord Jesus Christ in its fullness. Through Christ, our Head, the abundance of God's grace is at the disposal of every generation, but, alas! "Jesus has now many lovers of His heavenly kingdom, but few are willing to bear His cross…many follow Jesus to the breaking of bread, but few to the drinking of the chalice of His Passion."[13] We should unceasingly ask Our Lord to give us saints who, by their example, may rouse us from the torpor and mediocrity of our lives. For the need of our day is great. We seem to be fast approaching the culminating point of the open revolt from God's plan, which began with Luther in the sixteenth century. Luther's onslaught on order was an onslaught on the Mystical Body. The central point of his attack was directed against the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, the Sacrifice of the Mystical Body, visible expression of our fallen race's solidarity with Christ and of our dependence on Calvary for the possibility of presenting fully ordered homage to the Blessed Trinity.

We Catholics must, accordingly, put ourselves by intellect and will on the real level of the struggle. If we in imagination take our stand behind the gibbet of Calvary and see God the Father holding out His Son Crucified to men, with the real life of the world coming from His sacred wounds to every succeeding generation, we have a faint image of the reality. We are a fallen race. Through membership of Our Lord's Mystical Body, the Church, men in every generation since Calvary have received back supernatural life.[14]

---

[13] From the *Imitation of Christ*, Book 11, Chapter xi.

[14] *The Mystical Body of Christ in the Modern World*. Regina Publications. Dublin, 1964. pp. 15051. It is my humble opinion that the writings of Father Fahey, particularly this one, should be given the widest possible circulation and attention. I know of no other books which succeed so well in enlightening us on the history of this present era.

I have chosen these quotations at random. They could be multiplied indefinitely; books could be filled with them. Every saint has taken joy in speaking and writing about the glories of the Mass. Catholics have undergone most terrible sufferings, and even death, in order that they might attend it, and for having done so. Hardly a single pope has failed to write some word of inspiration for the faithful about it. What can the likes of me add to such a tradition and to such a devotion?

Yet, I must make an effort, at this point, to recall something of the splendor and indispensability of the Holy Sacrifice, in order that you may not fail to appreciate the seriousness of our present concern. For, one of the (countless) unhappy results of the coming of the "New Mass" is that words of thanksgiving and praise of the True Mass are less frequently heard, so that we are likely to treasure it less, or rarely to be reminded of its preciousness. I need also to make the effort to convince you that I would never write as I will, in the pages that follow, did the subject not require it. Even so, it will be painful enough. Perhaps this very anguish explains why it has not been done in a more worthy fashion by someone who is better qualified. Perhaps too, this is the reason why many others have not spoken out, it being not just a lack of courage.

As Mary and Joseph sought to protect their innocent Son from Herod, so we are all bound to protect and honor the Most Blessed Sacrament. We are not free merely not to profane it ourselves, but duty-bound to "throw our own bodies over it," as it were, to protect it from the least irreverence, to risk whatever consequences in the effort, and consider ourselves extremely blessed if we are called upon to do such a thing. There is simply nothing as holy and wonderful as the Mass.

The Mass is Christ in the act of offering His Body and Blood, Soul and Divinity to the Father in sacrifice, and to us, for our spiritual nourishment, under the humble and belying appearances of bread and wine. Because it is, in essence, the same act as that Death consummated on the Cross, it is equal to it in beauty, in perfection, and in power. Nothing on earth could be more pleasing to God than for the True Mass to be offered worthily; nothing more expressive of the love that Christ our Savior has for His Father, an unquenchable and infinite love; nothing more suitable for manifesting the glory of the Divine Trinity.

Like the Sacrifice of Calvary, it would have been *sufficient* for the salvation of the world had the Mass been offered only once, by Our Lord at the Last Supper. But out of the magnificence of His love, God has granted that it may be offered numberless times, thus adding, with each celebration, bounty to bounty, grace upon grace, "good measure and pressed down and shaken together and running over" (Luke 6:38).

The Holy Mass is the "wonderful exchange" and continuing intercourse the Church holds with its Lord and God through Christ, the Eternal and High Priest. It is the source and center of the Church's life, because it is the Act by which the Church "barters" from God its Daily Bread, His Mercy, His grace, and His munificence, surrendering to Him ever and again its one and only priceless Possession, Its Head and Victim, His Only-begotten Son. Without the Mass, truly, the Church would die for want of nourishment. (Is anyone ready to deny that the present deterioration, anemia, and faithlessness to which have befallen the Church, and whose ravages can be seen in every quarter—but particularly among the clergy and religious—are anything else than the inevitable effects of the most

complete discontinuance of the True Mass in the Latin Rite? Who will deny that there is a "a grievous famine in Samaria?" [3 Kings. 18:2]).

The same must be said of the souls of men. Neither can they live in Christ without His sacrifice and sustenance. It is a most harmful notion to imagine otherwise. Every man requires this event and this sacrament if he is to reach that sanctity to which he is called, and to which his inner being is drawn. He needs this prayer and mutual exchange of selves and communion with the Triune God, if he is to rise to that transcendent existence which conditions one for eternal life. And, despite the well-intentioned enthusiasm of the "born-again Christians," the words of Our Blessed Savior still hold true: "Except you eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you" (John 6:54).

What I say here is not new to Catholic readers. They are used to hearing it from their parish priests, or at least once were. They need to be reminded of such things afresh, as most of them have not yet considered the frightful vacuum into which they have been cast. No doubt, in many cases it is due to their previous poor attention to the Divine bountifulness of the Mass that they are now so indifferent to being deprived of it.

The basic thesis of this little tract requires that they themselves have a modicum of spiritual sensitivity, or, to say it better, love of God, lest they imagine my language too sharp or the issue here exaggerated. Unless they believe the dogmatic truth *that they cannot be saved—and therefore will be lost—without the Holy Sacrifice and the "Bread of Angels,"* they will continue lackadaisically to trust their lackadaisical bishops and priests, who tell them anything to keep them quiet and benign, who themselves admit that they are resting their total faith on the strange and nebulous words of Pope

Paul VI, all their previous credos and preachments and studies to the contrary notwithstanding.

B. The Council of Trent and the True Mass

If you and I have any inkling of the holiness and the necessity of the Mass, it is due, in no small degree, to the Council of Trent (1545–1563), which is described in the *Enchiridion* as "the greatest and most fruitful of all the Councils,"[15] as well as to the popes who reigned during the years of its convention, and promulgated its decrees, particularly Julius III (1550-1555) and Pius IV (1559–1565). But we owe our greatest debt of gratitude to Pope St. Pius V (1566–1572), whose reign followed its closing, but whose pontificate and personal sanctity so perfectly typified the spirit and magnified the influence of the Council. Until our present era, Catholics, especially the hierarchy, took pride in and guidance from the tradition and the doctrine enunciated by both the Council of Trent and by St. Pius V.

For our present purposes, it is very important to know these facts:

1. The Council of Trent was the least innovative of all the Councils and was most unapologetically Counter-Reformationist. Regarding the Blessed Eucharist, it wished to reassert the doctrines "taught by Christ Jesus Our Lord and His Apostles;" its predominant concern was the "uprooting of the execrable cockle of error and schism which human enemy has sown during our tragic time amidst the

[15] *Enchiridon Symbolorum*. Denziger-Schonmetzer. Herder. Barcelona. 1965. Conc, (Oecum XIX) Tridentium, Introduction. P. 363 "e*xcellentissimum atque fertilissimum omnium conciliorum."*

doctrine, the practice, and the Church, as a symbol of His unity and charity."[16]

2. The decrees of the Council on the Holy Mass have always been understood to be *ex cathedra* definitions:

> All the dogmatic and moral truths definitely contained in the liturgy which has been approved by the Holy See for the Universal Church, particularly those truths which pertain to the theology of the sacraments, the Sacrifice of the Mass and to the Holy Eucharist, bear the stamp of infallibility, having been solemnly defined long ago.[17]

3. The relationship between the doctrinal and moral truths, and the various rites and prayers and symbols was understood to be so intimate, so integral, that the latter were both the expression and the protection of the former. The "reformers" dared to ridicule the sacred ritual of the Mass, and, in their own fabrications, eliminated all but a few ceremonies on the excuse, mind you, that they were "purifying" Christian worship of its superstitious accretions; they were returning to the practice of the Early Church, for which reason the fathers of the Council of Trent decreed:

> Human nature being what it is, it is not easy for men to be lifted to the contemplation of divine things without external aids. For this reason, Holy Mother Church has instituted certain rites, such as, for example, the subdued voice on the one hand, and the upraised voice on the other, for the saying of Mass; it has introduced ceremonies also, such as, sacred blessings, candles, incense, vestments, and many other things of

[16] Ibid. pp. 284–85, No. 1635

[17] "Infallibilite." *Dictionnaire de Theologie Catholique*. Vol. 7, p. 1706.

> this nature, according to Apostolic discipline and tradition, in such a way that the majesty of this so great Sacrifice is enhanced, and that through these visible signs of worship and piety, the minds of the faithful may be elevated to the contemplation of the noblest of all things, which are hidden in the sacred Sacrifice.

And therefore:

> If anyone say that the ceremonies, the vestments, and the external signs, which the Catholic Church uses in the celebration of the Mass are more conducive to impiety than to piety, let him be anathema.[18]

C. Pope St. Pius V, *Quo Primum*, and the True Mass

In their zeal to justify the confusion they have helped to bring upon the Church, some present-day "reformers" have felt compelled to take a few swipes at the person of Pope St. Pius V (who, for obvious reasons, has become the patron of those who are not the "un-people" of the "New Religion"). This giant, even among giants, this "Super-Pope" as our children would call him, if they were allowed to hear his true story, does not need the likes of me to defend him or anything about his pontificate; such petty souls would have no ears for it anyways. How sad is their condition! They feel uncomfortable at being reminded of this pillar of orthodoxy, whose wisdom and goodness the Church Herself has declared glorious; whose love of Our Lord, of His Holy Mother, and of the Church was exemplary; whose purity and austerity and indifference to men's opinion were legend in his own day; whose sense of the loftiness and holy purpose of his papal authority was

[18] Ibid. p. 411, No. 1757. Canon 7.

extraordinary; and whose intolerance of sin in general and heresy in particular was terrible! He knew what this generation seems determined to deny, how heresy *causes* sin, and consequently *every* kind of social disorder, injustice, and spiritual tragedy—and that for generations unending. He was fearfully severe toward selfishness and slovenliness among the clergy; falsity or disloyalty he would not have around him; and he ruled the Papal States as fairly and sternly as he did the Church. He was almost "too much," except that, within a few weeks after his election, the faithful, particularly the poor, realized that at last they had in the Pope, a protector, a father, a hero, and happiest of all, a saint, who required much more of himself than of anyone else. (It does not hurt to notice that this man, who ruled with strictest justice, who made no effort to be popular, was well-loved and willingly obeyed by his flock. Should this not say something to the clergy of our generation?)

Perhaps the most characteristic quality of St. Pius' reign was its authoritativeness. When one reads the Saint's decree, *Quo Primum*, one cannot deny that it was his intention to give it all the force with which his office empowered him, both legislative and magisterial. He obviously had not the slightest doubt that he had the right to speak as he was doing; it did not occur to him that he could not legislate for all time to come; he could not imagine that any Catholic would ever consider his language unorthodox, and no pope nor Doctor of the Church has ever suggested that he was doing other than following in the true tradition of the papacy, which has charge of the Keys of the Kingdom. From the point of view of its phrasing, one could hardly imagine a more authoritative statement or a more stringently binding law, or an edict which might conceivably be interpreted in any way other than as *irrevocable*. When one reads this decree, he cannot help wondering whether St. Pius had been

given some premonition of our present age and our present situation, although the hatred of the Mass, which the Protestants on the Continent and in England were spreading with utter malice among the defenseless people in those days, is sufficient explanation for both the tone and the finality of it.

Quo Primum is Pope St. Pius' Bull introducing and imposing the *Missale Romanum*. Contrary to what is being said by many, the "Tridentine Mass" was not a "*Novus Ordo*" of its own day, nor was it ever thought to be by anyone.

> Essentially, the Missal of Pius V is the Gregorian Sacramentary; that again is formed from the Galasian book, which depends on the Leonine collection. We find prayers of our Canon in the treatise D*e Sacramentis* and allusions to it in the IVth Century. So our Mass goes back, without essential change, to the age when it first developed out of the oldest liturgy of all. It is still redolent of that liturgy, of the days when Caesar ruled the world and thought he could stamp out the Faith of Christ, when our fathers met together before dawn and sang a hymn to Christ as to a god. The final result of our enquiry is that, in spite of unsolved problems, in spite of later changes, there is not in Christendom another rite so venerable as ours.[19]

There is, therefore, no such thing as a "Tridentine Mass," or a "Mass of St. Pius V," strictly speaking, for which reason I reluctantly use the terms here and do so in quotation marks. It is almost a concession to present-day "reformers" to employ such terms. Better to refer to it as the "Mass of the Roman Rite," or the "Traditional Catholic Mass," or the like. Before I

[19] *The Mass—A Study of the Roman Liturgy*. Adrian Fortescue. Longmans, Green & Co. London, 1950. p. 213.

am finished here, you will understand why I feel obligated to speak of it as the "True Mass," if you do not already. According to Fortescue, the work of the Tridentine Commission, which produced the *Missale Romanum*, consisted mainly of purging from the liturgy disparate "medieval accretions" and establishing a single ceremonial for practically all churches of the Roman Rite.[20]

In Appendix I of my book, I quote the translation of *Quo Primum* in full; below I give what has become, over the last few years, a well-known excerpt. Read it carefully, as there follows a number of important deductions to be made from it. While reading it, keep in mind that every successor of Pope St. Pius V has ratified this act of his, thirty-six in all. Though several of the popes have authorized revisions and re-editions of the "*Missale*", all such revisions contain this letter as their first preface; all of them consciously abide by its legislation. And these revisions include the last edition, made by Pope John XXIII, dated July 25, 1960, which means that the age of *Quo Primum* is no argument whatsoever against its binding force; even he who summoned the Second Vatican Council seemed to feel bound by it (*at least, as of then*). From *Quo Primum*:

> We specifically command each and every patriarch, administrator, and all other persons of whatever ecclesiastical dignity they may be, be they even cardinals of The Holy Roman Church, or possessed of any other rank or pre-eminence, and We order them in virtue of holy obedience to chant or to read the Mass according to the rite and manner and norm herewith laid down by Us and, hereafter, to discontinue and completely discard all other rubrics and rites of other missals, however ancient, which they have customarily

[20] Ibid. pp. 207–208

followed; and they must not in celebrating Mass presume to introduce any ceremonies or recite any prayers other than those contained in this Missal.

Furthermore, by these presents (this law), in virtue of Our Apostolic Authority, We grant and concede in perpetuity that, for the chanting or reading of the Mass in any church whatsoever, this Missal is hereafter to be followed absolutely, without any scruple of conscience or fear of incurring any penalty, judgment, or censure, and canons, chaplains, and other secular priests, or religious, of whatever order or by whatever title designated, obliged to celebrate the Mass otherwise than as enjoined by Us. We likewise declare and ordain that no one whosoever is to be forced or coerced to alter this Missal, and that this present document cannot be revoked or modified, but remain always valid and retain its full force—notwithstanding the previous constitutions and decrees of the Holy See, as well as any general or special constitutions or edicts of provincial or sinodal councils, and notwithstanding the practice and custom of the aforesaid churches, established by long and immemorial prescription-except, however, if of more than two hundred years' standing.

Therefore, no one whosoever is permitted to alter this letter or heedlessly to venture to go contrary to this notice of Our permission, statute, ordinance, command, precept, grant, indult, declaration, will, decree, and prohibition. Should anyone, however, presume to commit such an act, he should know that he will incur the wrath of Almighty God and of the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul.[21]

These words gall modern-day enemies of the Holy Mass, as well they ought. They make a large swath. How the

[21] *Missale Romanum*. Desclee & Socii. Turin. 1962. pp. iv–vi. Cf. Appendix I of the present work, where the entire Apostolic Constitution is printed.

"reformers" wish they had never been written! It will be noticed that, in all their zeal for the vernacular, they studiously avoided putting a translation of these words into any of their "missals." A clear understanding of the meaning of St. Pius V's law is absolutely necessary to follow the argument of this writing.

We shall analyze Quo Primum in terms of those elements which are required for a valid law.

1. *The object of the law:* The *Missale Romanum* is now the standard Missal of the Roman Rite. The Mass as it is codified herein is "normative;" it is the only Mass. Nor may there be any other; all other missals are proscribed from this day forward. The only exceptions to this rule are those missals which have been used continuously in certain places, and by certain communities, for at least two hundred years. The obvious implication being made here is that it is impossible to "create" a "new rite" within the Roman Rite, since no such rite would have any continuity with the traditions of the Church.

That the prayers and ritual of the Mass as they are formulated in this Missal may be carefully preserved and that all danger of doctrinal corruption or ceremonial impropriety may be removed, this Missal is to be considered fixed and unalterable. No reason for making any major changes in it is envisioned. This decree condemns the idea that the Missal will ever need to be reformed. Consequently, any suggestion that a reform in it is necessary should be regarded as highly suspect and dangerous. Henceforth, this Missal will be one of the standards by which need for reform in the Church must be judged, and if the Church ever falls away from obedience to this decree, a liturgical reform will by that fact be called for, which will consist of a return to the use of this Missal.

This is not to say that *absolutely nothing* can be changed in the "*Missale*." It will be for the pope and him alone to make

any changes in it which he may find necessary and advisable. However, since such changes can pertain only to details, it is out of the question that any changes at all could ever be described as absolutely necessary.

In accord with the prescription, Pope Urban VII, for instance, arranged for a simplification and clarification of some of the rubrics of the Mass in his revision of 1634.[22]

It would seem, however, that even the slightest alteration made in the Canon of the Mass would be gravely contrary to a centuries-old liturgical tradition.[23] Only slightly less grave would be a change in the Ordinary of the Mass, which includes all the prayers and rubrics from the Prayers at the Foot of the Altar to the Last Gospel. With this decree, the Last Gospel was made an integral part of the rite. Latin is the liturgical language of the Roman Rite; the use of vernacular languages is forbidden.[24]

2. *The subjects of the law:* This Missal must be used in all the cathedrals, churches, chapels, oratories, etc., of the Roman Rite. Again, the only exceptions are those places and communities granted the exemption mentioned above. The law binds all Catholics of the Latin Church, including all priests, both secular and religious, chaplains, canons, religious superiors, administrators, all prelates, including bishops and even cardinals. Not only are these men bound to use the Missal, but they are strictly admonished to adhere to it scrupulously, neither omitting anything from it,

[22] Fortescue. Op. cit. p. 209.

[23] "The Robber Church" (Part 2). Patrick Henry Omlor. *Interdum*. Issue No. 7, May 31, 1971. Box R., Menlo Park, Calif. Pp 3–4.

[24] *Enchiridon Symbolorum*. Cc. Trid. Sess. XXIII, loc cit.: p. 411, No. 1759, Canon 9: "If anyone says that the rite of the Roman Church by which a part of the Canon and the words of Consecration are said in a subdued voice or that water should not be added to the wine in the chalice, which is to be offered, since it is contrary to the institution of Christ, let him be anathema."

altering it, nor adding anything to it, either by way of prayers or ceremonies.

The full meaning of this ruling will be missed if the reader fails to recall that before this time, there was a great lack of uniformity in the manner of saying the Mass. This is not to say that there was doctrinal divergence; the variations were all minor and included prayers and ceremonies. Such variation is explained by the fact that there had never before been complete uniformity, such as this decree was then legislating. Immemorial customs and special privileges and nationalistic influences explained the variety; and also, bishops of dioceses, heads of religious communities, even Catholic princes had been allowed some say in liturgical matters. The main effect of this decree was to deprive all who held authority over Catholics of such prerogatives, and to concentrate the right to legislate concerning the Holy Mass into the hands of the Supreme Pontiff himself.

The attempt on the part of anyone to countermand this decree will be grossly sinful, scandalous, and gravely injurious to the Faith. Legally, it will be completely illicit, null and void, and bring on its perpetrators the heaviest censures. It is presumed that such an attempt would be made by one or more men—a prelate, a council, a group of bishops, a king, some government, or the like—who might be thought to have the authority to do it, and who might be able to make it look right, good, necessary, and urgent. All the faithful should understand in advance that nothing could justify such an action, nothing could legalize it. He who attempts to abolish this Missal—probably by the substitution of a counterfeit—could have only the same kind of intentions that the Protestant "Reformers" have proved themselves to have, namely, subversion and desecration. To do such a thing, that person should be presumed to have the most sinister intentions and

heterodox beliefs. His act will be judged by Almighty God and His Beloved Apostles as a direct assault on the Holy Mass and the True Faith. In a word, it will be a most terrible sin, a sacrilege, a brazen and wanton effort to destroy the Mass and the Church.

Just as all those in authority are henceforth forbidden to change or replace the Missal, all their subjects are commanded to refuse any cooperation with the smallest gesture toward such a transgression. Priests particularly are directed to be ready to suffer ecclesiastical penalties for their refusal to "knuckle under." All cooperation must be regarded as participation and collaboration in this attack on the Mass and therefore gravely sinful, even *sacrilegious*. Obviously, if no one obeys such a command, the whole effort will be frustrated from the start, as well it ought.

The violation of this law by any number of people, of whatever rank and prerogative, no matter how frequently, would never abrogate it or render it less binding on them and on all other Catholics, nor reduce in the least the gravity of the sin being committed. The only effects of a general defiance of it would be to call down from Heaven a most terrible punishment upon all such rebels.

3. *The penalties for violating this law:* To attempt to say Mass in a way different from that prescribed in the *Missale* is a serious sin of sacrilege. (A sacrilege is defined as the "violation of a sacred thing.") Further, to attempt to alter the Missal in an essential way is likewise a sacrilegious act. The ecclesiastical penalty for either of these sins is the incurrence of the censure of excommunication *latae sententiae* (i.e., the censure must be imposed by an ecclesiastical court after the sin has been proved).

4. *The tine of the law's implementation:* The decree requires that all the priests of the Roman Curia begin to use the

Missale Romanum within one month of the date of its promulgation (July 14, 1570); those on the Italian side of the Alps must begin within three months; those on the other side of the Alps within six months or as soon as they can procure the new Missal.

The decree must be considered irrevocable, for so its author meant it to be: "This present document cannot be revoked or modified, but remain(s) always valid and retain(s) its full force" (Appendix I). Therefore no one may validly repeal or countermand it, the reason being, it imposes a moral obligation from which no Catholic can be dispensed. As Catholics, the successors of Pope St. Pius V will be morally bound to adhere to, uphold, and enforce this law.

It may be argued that since one pope does not have the power to enact a law which his successors may not abrogate, *Quo Primum* may be abrogated, as it is thought to have been by Pope Paul VI. It is true that a pope may not pass a merely *ecclesiastical law* which His successors may not abrogate, but it is the office and duty of every pope to enunciate and specify moral obligations which are essential to the Christian life. In enacting the decree *Quo Primum*, St. Pius so specified the moral obligations of all Catholics. More than this, the popes are expected to be the most perfect exemplars of the moral obligation so enunciated by themselves and their predecessors, particularly such as pertain to the divine liturgy.

The *Missale Romanum* is the codification of the Mass of the Roman Rite. It does two things therefore: it brings to an end the ritual development of the Mass, and it suppresses the use of all other missals. In effect, therefore, it identifies the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass with the Mass of this *Missale*, so that, henceforth, all Catholics are morally bound to direct the faith and reverence which are due the Holy Sacrifice, and all the doctrines expressed in and by it, toward the Mass

of the *Missale Romanum*. Bear in mind, the Mass we are speaking of is, after all, essentially that to which the Council of Trent had reference in its decrees and solemn definitions, which definitions all Catholics must give obeisance if they would be saved.

By the decree *Quo Primum*, Pope St. Pius put the Mass in the hands of his successors for its protection, in an effort to do all that a pope might do to establish its form as inviolable and unalterable. He sought to strengthen his law further by binding all Catholics, under pain of mortal sin and the threat of excommunication, to refuse obedience to anyone, even to a pope, who should attempt to alter the Missal substantially. Though no pope may bind by law his successors, because of the moral principles involved, all popes are as bound to obey the prescriptions of Pope St. Pius' decree as anyone else, only more so. The one exception to this truth is that, whereas no one else may make the slightest change in the rite of the Mass, a pope may licitly make incidental and minor ones which may improve it and be of benefit to the worship of the faithful.

Recall that, as we have seen, popes are not infallible in the exercise of their legislative power; they are capable of enacting both foolish and bad laws, of commanding that which is foolish and that which is sinful. *Quo Primum* cannot remove the possibility that, at some future time, a pope may attempt legally to alter the Mass radically, or even to abolish it. Its main concern is to repose the Mass in the hands of him who is least likely to alter it or to allow others to do so.

Neither when the great Pope issued this decree, nor ever since, until very recently, has anyone questioned its validity. Many today, not understanding it clearly, have presumed to disregard its uncompromising language and claim that, as a "merely ecclesiastical law," it could be abrogated by any of the

successors of St. Pius. Perhaps they will be checked somewhat in their offhandedness by being challenged to find an explicit admission from Pope Paul VI that he considers this law either revocable or to have been revoked by himself.

It can also be said that no one of any stature has ever suggested that the Saint was over-reaching his papal authority by codifying the ritual of the Roman Mass, or by doing so in such apodictic terms. No one was startled or surprised when he issued *Quo Primum*, and the Church in his day accepted the *Missale Romanum* without quarrel or difficulty. It is only since the issuance of the "New Mass" of Pope Paul VI that many Catholics, particularly priests, have begun to question its irrevocability. They have done so out of their need to reconcile *Quo Primum* with the "New Mass" and with the murmurings of their own consciences. Not being able to do so honestly, they argue that, indeed, Pope St. Pius spoke extremely; his words should not be taken literally. In other words, he made a mistake.

If these people would only study the decree, they would realize that there is no reason for them to proceed in such a fashion, nor will it do them any good, for the simple reason that its irrevocability is intrinsic to the nature of its object and purpose. Its object is the Holy Mass, which it seeks to give a final and definitive form, and its purpose is to provide maximum protection for the Mass in order to keep it doctrinally pure and liturgically inviolable. Its method is to consign the Mass and the Missal to the hands of the Supreme Pontiff only. He alone may make whatever accidental changes and adjustments which future circumstances and the wisdom of experience dictate; he alone and no one else.

Quo Primum takes for granted that *neither the pope nor anyone else may alter the* Missale *radically or replace it completely*, for to do such a thing would necessarily violate the Mass itself

and contradict all the traditions which gave it its form. There has never been a time when a pope or anyone else had the right to *design* or *create* a Mass, since the formation of the Mass was the work of the Church over the centuries. A Mass must have evolved from the traditions of the Apostles themselves.

The discussion which follows will in no way seek to prove the foregoing because any argument to the contrary is manifestly untenable. The question which now plagues the Church is to what extent Pope Paul VI *has* changed the Mass, whether in an essential way, or in merely secondary and non-essential details.

D. The Act

> *And he (Elias) said: I have not troubled Israel, but thou and thy father's house, who have forsaken the commandments of the Lord, and have followed Baalim.*
>
> 3 Kings 18:18

If the reader has begun to reach certain disturbing conclusions after having studied Pope St. Pius V's Apostolic Constitution, *Quo Primum*, let him, with prayer if necessary, steel himself to complete the task. Let him know that he is not the first person to arrive at them, however reluctantly. St. Pius, speaking with full consciousness of his authority, says in his decree that anyone who attempts to say Mass in a way which is radically different from that set forth in the *Missale Romanum* commits a very grave sin. Likewise, anyone who presumes to alter the *Missale* or to replace it, in order to have others say Mass thus differently commits a very grave sin. Such acts would be grievously sinful no matter who committed them because, of their nature, they would be totally antithetic to the True Mass and to the will

of God, to Whom Mass is offered. These very things are what the presently-reigning [1971] Pope has done. He has begun to say Mass in a new way. He has thrown aside the *Missale Romanum* and put another book, called the *Novus Ordo Missae*, in its place, which book contains the formula for a *completely new* "Mass". And he has informed the Catholics of the Roman Rite that the Old Mass is of no more use. From now on, he is saying, "*This* is your Mass" (cf. Exodus 32:4), speaking of a bureaucratically manufactured and recognizable Affair, which we now refer to (for want of a better name) as the "New Mass." Pope Paul VI has done exactly what Pope St. Pius said no one must ever do, what no one could ever do licitly, and what no one could ever do without most certainly inviting upon himself, and all who take part in his sin, the terrible "wrath of Almighty God and of the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul" (*Quo Primum*).

Let me assure you that I know the magnitude of what I am accusing. Am I magnifying things? *Look again, and see what St. Pius' decree says. For it says what it says, even if no one pays attention!*

The whole gigantic, sinful act is before us all, no matter how reluctant we are to see it or to call it by its true name. Out of the great reverence for the papacy and their love for any man whom Christ chooses to be His Vicar, all but a very, very few have refused to admit the truth, even to themselves: *The presently-reigning Supreme Pontiff [Paul VI] has perpetrated a direct attack on the all-holy Mass; he has committed the great and unspeakable sacrilege!* With painstaking gradualism, with plotted procedure, in consort with men not even of the Faith, he has engineered (or allowed the engineering of) the piecemeal dismantlement of the True Mass in each of its parts; he has cloven the indivisible—which is butchery—and replaced it with a Contrivance; a mere Shell and Charade.

The Pope's Act is one of the great sins of all history, surpassing even those of Luther and Cranmer in its enormity, in its scandal, and in its infidelity, and rivaling those of Adam and Judas! From the day of the installation of the "New Mass," to this present one, the whole Church lies like a wounded animal, and the whole world watches in stunned disbelief. The disruption is complete. The churches are the scenes of countless, indescribable profanations, and the behavior of many Catholics, particularly many priests and religious, borders on total madness. At the sight of the appalling and ever-increasing disorder and immorality, many pious souls are unable to suppress the question which until this present era seemed mystically unreal: Could this be the time and could the so-called *Novus Ordo Missae* be that thing, which was spoken of by Daniel the prophet in his eighth chapter?

> *And it* [the Revolution] *was magnified even unto the strength* [True Mass] *of Heaven* [the Church]*; and it threw down of the strength* [Mass] *and of the stars* [bishops] *and trod upon them.*
>
> *And it was magnified even to the prince* [the pope] *of the strength; and it took away from him the continual sacrifice* [the Mass] *and cast down the place of his sanctuary.*
>
> *And strength was given him against the continual sacrifice, because of sins; and truth* [the Faith] *shall be cast down on the ground, and he shall do and shall prosper.*
>
> *And I heard one of the saints speaking, and one saint said to another, I know not to whom that was speaking: How long shall be the vision, concerning the continual sacrifice and the sin of desolation* [The "New Mass"] *that is made; and the sanctuary and the strength be trodden under foot? And he said to him: Unto evening and morning, two thousand three hundred days; and the sanctuary shall be cleansed.*
>
> Daniel 8:10–14

And could this name-bearer of the Great Apostle be that mysterious personage spoken of by the far-seeing Eagle among the Evangelists:

> *And I saw a star fall from Heaven upon the earth, and there was given to him the key of the bottomless pit.*
>
> *And he opened the bottomless pit: and the smoke of the pit arose, as the smoke of a great furnace; And the sun and the air were darkened with the smoke of the pit.*
>
> *And from the smoke of the pit there came out locusts upon the earth. And power was given to them, as the scorpions of the earth have power:*
>
> *And it was commanded them that they should not hurt the grass of the earth, nor any green thing, nor any tree, but only the men who have not the sign of God on their foreheads.*
>
> Apocalypse 9:1–4.

Can it be that this Pope is the "star" fallen from the holiest office which a man may hold in the Church ("Heaven"), and with the "key" of his "New Mass" have opened up the "pit" of Hell, from which now leap forth every sort of blasphemy, irreverence, and sacrilege? We are witnesses of it: what abomination has not been committed in one or another of the Lord's sanctuaries, where the Eternal High Priest was but recently wont to renew His perfect oblation. All in attendance would say, "My Lord and my God!" At the sight of the almost total renunciation of the Faith on the part of the hierarchy of the Church and the lamentable confusedness of the clergy, we cannot help wondering how it is that our much-offended God has not already loosed His avenging angel. How will the prophecies be fulfilled? When and how will this incredible epoch end?

In order to accomplish the task of introducing the "*Novus Ordo*," the Pope found it necessary to proceed methodically, to engage in a Program of hypocritical deception. Before the final form of the Mimic-mass was unveiled (as if what we have now were the final form), Pope Paul stood by while his "liturgists" picked apart the Mass of the Saints. And with every step, he pacified and cajoled the faithful with words of piety and religiosity, giving himself sanctuary the while with the inviolability of the august papacy and the doctrine of papal infallibility.

Does this accusation shock you? That it should is understandable because it is against our every inclination to see any fault at all in the pope. You are confronted with the plainly visible fact, however. The intrinsic wickedness of this Act is clearly epitomized in the "New Mass," which, so it is being preached, you must attend, at least every Sunday and holyday —while the True Mass has been made "illicit" (as if that were possible by any power on earth or under the earth).

It was ever the scheme of the Revolution to do the incredible, so that those who make the accusation will never be believed. And this scheme is aided by the muddled thinking about papal infallibility on the part of most Catholics. Added to this, in what is referred to as the "conservative camp", many have labored these last few years in an effort to circumvent the obvious and undeniable. Some have striven to find an excuse for the great mockery, which is the "*Novus Ordo*;" others have felt bound to construct elaborate theories to exonerate or excommunicate or illegitimatize Pope Paul. Their ragged efforts have contributed to the creation of various persuasions and factions within the Church. But most of their theories satisfy their authors and a few others only, because parts were always left over. The "parts" were those Pope Paul himself played in bringing off this incredible transplantation.

Why is it necessary for anyone to theorize at all, so long as he keeps his catechism answers in mind? You and I are under no obligation to judge the conscience of Pope Paul VI, less perhaps his, than that of any other human being. *And the act of abolishing the True Mass is too plainly visible for anyone to deny.* To put it bluntly, as has happened in the past, a pope has failed the Church. (Were such a thing not possible, we would never pray for him.) It is not ours to say how knowing or how guilty he is because we cannot know the state of his mind. I do not mean by this, however, to disparage his sanity, which seems unquestionable, and which it seems presumptuous to deny, as some have. I mean that *we can judge only the material evil of the Act*. This we can hardly keep from doing because, as I said above, the *Thing is right here in front of us*. That we *must* make a decision concerning it is a matter of our own faith and salvation.

Does my accusation shock you, I ask again? Let me pose to you a further question: Does Pope Paul VI truly consider his "*Novus Ordo*" a Mass, or *the* Mass? If he does, why does he continue to permit every form of profanation of it? If, as is obviously the case, his bishops are either indifferent about or incapable of stopping its defilement, which is so rampant as to be one of its hallmarks, what is the Pope's excuse?

Does His Holiness lack the authority to bring such profanations to a halt? If he has the authority to sweep away the laws of *all the other popes*, saying the while that he does so under the influence of the Holy Spirit and according to the "authentic traditions" of the popes, does he not have the authority to order mere bishops to see that such abuses cease? (A brief note from his desk will incapacitate a bishop

permanently!) Certainly not! Yet he has complained of them repeatedly, even in tears.

Has he no idea what he might do about them? You could not make even yourself believe it! He has proved himself both shrewd and competent enough to do what no one would ever have dreamed possible; he has performed one of the most flagitious hoaxes of history—akin, terrible as it is to say, to the Black Mass. If the question of either its possibility or its permissibility had been posed to any Catholic theologian or historian or scholar, fifteen years ago [1966], each would have said, unhesitatingly, the very thought of such a thing were itself a profanation toward the Mass and an affront to the papacy. It was just this very wonderful veneration of both the pope and the Mass on the part of all Catholics, great and small, that was exploited for the accomplishment of this sinister Act.

The Pope has not done this single-handedly, of course. The Vatican in recent years has taken on the appearances of the Federal Government of the United States: one never knows who is really *in power*. For many years now, he who has authority in this country has had no power—if he values his life. However, in the case of the danger of the least desecration of the Mass, Christ Himself would expect any Catholic to suffer torture and death rather than abet or aid it. More, he must endure anything rather than *permit* such an iniquity.

No, you must admit it: this monstrous Transgression is the Pope's own, at least to the extent that what only the Pope could do, what he alone had to do that it be accomplished, that much he did. Those who wanted *not renewal*, *but revolution* in the Catholic liturgy knew well they would require

the services of the pope, and Pope Paul's have been abundantly and (apparently) enthusiastically available.[25]

If my accusation does shock you, let me ask: why? Is it not because accusing the Pope of such a misdeed seems to you more sacrilegious than what he has done to the Mass? If such be the case, could it possibly be that the whole grand program for your subversion has had its debilitating effect on your own sense of value? Contrary to what you once believed, do you now accept the notion that the august Sacrifice of Christ, that mediatory act by which all the prayers of men are capitulated in ("gathered up into") the Sacrifice of the Cross, is subject to any shape, any value, and any meaning this Pope or anyone else pleases to give it?

Ignoring the law of *Quo Primum*, Pope Paul VI handed the Mass over to committees of "liturgists," "scholars," "translators," and Revolutionaries, that they might re-think, re-write, re-issue, and re-explain it. The net result is that now the "New Mass" has no definite form or meaning.

Let me ask you another question: Is not my contention the least damning of all? Were it not better for this "New Mass" not to be a Mass, that it might be less offensive to

[25] Giovanni Baptiste Montini was one of the most articulate advocates of liturgical reform before he became Pope. Evidence of this can be easily gathered. A noteworthy instance can be found in *Worship*, Vol. 33 No. 3, a pastoral letter of his entitled: "Liturgical Formation." Nothing would be made of this were it not so inexplicable how most of the people who were campaigning in what was called "The Liturgical Movement" in those days (1958) have long since become silent and are nowhere to be found. Pope Paul is one of the few remaining spokesmen who has not become disenchanted, proved too conservative, or become unwelcome among those who continue to formulate ideas and agitate for further "renewal," and who now seem to have things very much their way. The article referred to appears to be harmless enough. It is concerned with steps to be taken for the education of the people into the "liturgical renewal" that they might participate as an intelligent community in the sacred rites. The remarkable thing is that the methods suggested there by the brilliant (then) Archbishop of Milan have since been employed, not for the sake of the ancient liturgy, but for the introduction of its preposterous Paradigm.

God? After all, which is better to say: the Pope permits these profanations of a false 'mass' or of a true one? Which is the greater sin? In my judgment this Facsimile is nothing but a sacrilege. But because it pretends to be the Mass, I could not go into a church and perform the abominations which the Pope, the bishops, and many priests call it "modern" to condone. Could you? And if you could not, how is it different with them; are they not also mere men? For all his divinely-bestowed sovereignty, the Pope is still not God, you know.

Yes, I know it will be argued that the sacrileges are the exceptions and that they are not the "New Mass" itself. No, here is where you have failed to understand this clever Impiety. You have failed to notice that what you regard as sacrilegious is in no sense of the word *really* shocking or disturbing either to those who devised it, or for those who now enjoy it as the rite of their own liberation. If you understand the "New Mass" and the perverse thinking which produced it, you are in no way surprised that its appearance signaled and let loose in the churches every kind of frivolous and mad-cap antic, and that in the name of religion. Of its very nature, the "New Mass" "liberates" the "children of God" that they might make a game out of worship. It claims to be able to render holy and pleasing to God, "having the odor of sweetness," every crudity, every inanity, every indecency. It claims to have the power to dispense any brazen boor who favors it with his attendance from all faith, all rightness of heart, all humility, and every divine prescription. (No, the exceptions are the presently-reigning [1971] Pontiff, his cowed bishops, and their mousy priests, all of whom think it "kind" and "ecumenical" and "forbearing" to tolerate the many desecrations which the "*Novus Ordo,*" of its very nature, unleashes against itself, and—let it never be omitted—against the True Mass, which it mocks!)

Some may say, you are identifying the abuses with the "New Mass" itself. *I am saying that the "New Mass"* ***is*** *the abuse of the True Mass!* I am saying that, with the jettisoning of both the law and the spirit of *Quo Primum*, by that very Act, the Pope has not only substituted something totally different from the Mass, but that it is of the very essence of the "New Mass" to permit every form of profanation, *because the "New Mass" makes the good pleasure of the people its "liturgy."* Intrinsic to the very idea of the "New Mass" is that the *people* are more important than Christ the Savior, than His Sacrifice to His Heavenly Father, than the Church, His Bride. In the "New Religion," THE PEOPLE IS BAAL! Is it not they who must be entertained, accommodated, and emoted over? In the incessantly repeated phrase, "The People of God," it is the *people* who, in Marxist fashion, are being acclaimed—not God. They are misled who, in attempting to criticize the "New Mass," complain that the people have been made equal to the priest, or that the priest has been brought down to the level of the people. *Oh no; rather, they have both been given the place of God!*

Not until you accept this incredible fact will you be able to see the whole matter, clearly, as shocking and ghastly as it is. Again, its sheer incredibility blinds us to what is right before us. Only this fact explains why the "New Liturgy" *requires the complete riddance of the True Mass*, and all that pertains to it. It could never coexist with the True Mass since it is diametrically opposite. Consider, for instance, how it has been necessary to purge completely even the architecture and adornment of all the appointments of our churches. For they bespeak the nature of the True Mass, so different from the "New Mass." Step by step, the altar was dismantled, the tabernacle was relegated, the statues were removed, the stations were taken down, the communion rail was hauled

out. Everything symbolic of the mysteries and the glories of the Faith had to be cleared away. In their fanaticism and ignorance, they who accomplished this pleaded that these things were either old-fashioned or poor art, or some such nonsense. This is not to defend cheap or manufactured or soulless art-pieces. Nor is it a condemnation of all art that is contemporary. It is, rather, the exposure of this Revolutionary belligerence towards all things Catholic.

Consider further how the priest now faces the people. He "presides" over their activities, and arranges that all be done for their pleasure and satisfaction. Yes, I know some will say, 'You are going too far. You are talking about the most extreme cases.' No, that is where you err. I am talking about those places where the "New Liturgy" has been truly understood and fully implemented. Your mistake is that you are thinking of those places where the priests and people have as yet failed to do so. They are nothing but foot-draggers, hold-outs; the priest there has somehow been able to compromise sufficiently so that he has kept his place, fended off the inevitable, while he has (somehow) kept his own conscience well-muzzled. Once he is gone, however, and he expects to be given his notice any day—all depends on the good pleasure of His Excellency, or his "associate-pastor," or the sisters (now more to be feared than the wives of the sultan), or the parish council—"progress" will resume.

Where this has already happened, the true setting for the "*Novus Ordo*" can be observed. The new churches speak volumes. Everything is centered around the Table. The Eucharist—or what purports to be the Eucharist—is either shunted off to the side somewhere (another temporary arrangement), or is nowhere to be found (the final arrangement). The President's Chair, or the Episcopal throne, now occupies the highest and most prominent place, that place

where the altar and tabernacle used to be. The "New Mass" contains no rubric which presumes or requires either.

Again, some may say, 'you are condemning the abuses and calling them the "New Liturgy."' I am saying, what can you do about it? The "New Liturgy" *permits*, nay, *inspires* and *encourages* the abuses with its totally untraditionalist, ridiculous "options." *It is contrary to the very idea of "ritual" that it be "optional."* I am saying that with the discarding of the *Missale Romanum*, the Pope has undermined all authority, including his own, so that no one can prevent any and every form of sacrilege and impiety. By contradicting the idea that the divine liturgy was or can be fixed, he has taught that it cannot be: so, the "liturgy" now consists of anything any fool decides it to be. And if you think my logic not perfectly consistent, prove it! Let the bishops prove it; let them attempt to "regulate" the "New Liturgy;" let them begin to try to enforce Catholic Orthodoxy from their pulpits; let them try to tell their clergy what they may and may not do at their "mass." They have already found it impossible because the "New Liturgy" of its very nature makes it so.

Finally, you may say, 'You are basing your whole argument on one decree of one pope, Pope St. Pius V, which decree was not an *ex cathedra* definition, since, according to you, the doctrines articulated in the Mass were not defined by it, but by the Council of Trent before the reign of St. Pius.' It is true, I am not saying that the decree was an *ex cathedra* definition; were I to say that, I would be contradicting my explanation of the doctrine of papal infallibility, which I said, can only be exercised with regard to specific doctrinal or moral propositions; the rite of the Mass is not in this category. However, I am not basing my argument on one decree only, *but on the constant Tradition of the Church before and after "Quo Primum,"* a document which merely enunciated this Tradition

in unmistakable language. My argument is really based on all the documents of the Church which concern themselves with the Mass of the Roman Rite, for they know of no other and admit of no other Mass. There are no documents which go contrary to *Quo Primum*, if one excepts the decrees of the Second Vatican Council—a subject we must not get embroiled in here. It is not, therefore, a matter of choosing the teaching and law of one pope and rejecting those of another. *It is a matter of choosing the traditional teaching and incontrovertibly binding law of the entire Church against the "wishes" of one Pope, which have no validity as law whatsoever.* (On this last point, more will be said later.)

Catholics will have to open their eyes to the simple fact that no pope may abolish the Mass without denying his faith, without incurring the censures of the Council of Trent, and without giving greatest scandal. No matter if it be the pope, he who commands that which is contrary to the teachings of *Quo Primum*, must be disobeyed; not to do so would be sinful.

The cancerous idea that any pope may abrogate any and all the laws of the Church, and introduce an entirely new body of doctrine, a brand new code of morality, an all-new book of rules, and a totally new concept of the nature of the Church is so utterly preposterous, that I am at a loss how to combat it. The notion has to be the ultimate form of "legalism"! According to this way of thinking, at the accession of the successor of Pope Paul, none of us should be surprised nor raise objection if the new pope discards the "Novus Ordo" and brings out a "mass" more to *his* liking. Should *he* die six months after his "mass" has been inaugurated, his *successor* may come forth with yet another model. (Well, now!)

It will be observed, I am not attempting here to judge whether the consecration of the "New Mass" is valid. Let us hope not, that it might be somewhat less sacrilegious. I

presume all are aware that even should Transubstantiation take place, the "New Mass" would not for that reason be a worthy sacrifice, only a more terrible offense to the majesty and magnificence of God. In the True Mass, the act of Transubstantiation provides the Sacrifice with its Victim and its Offerer, Who, in the rites which follow, yields Himself up to the Father in adoration and atonement, and then hands Himself over to such poor and needy souls as we to be their Food; in the "New Mass" Christ may or may not be present, while those whom He loves, despite all, gather round to celebrate their own penurious communalism and to take full advantage of His (temporary) tolerance of this Outrage. Notwithstanding much insistence from official quarters to the contrary, *there is a high likelihood of the invalidity of this Sacrilege's "consecration rite."* Part of the evidence is, of course, the fact that the Pope and all his army of "experts," "liturgists," and "theologians"—ably assisted by his bishops—have found the chemicals to sterilize their "*missale*" and our churches of all testimony to the need for, or belief in, the realities of the Unbloody Sacrifice and the Real Presence of Christ. At the same time, they have shown themselves totally incapable of, and uninterested in, proving that these essential mysteries have survived their mad antibioticism.

And yet, everything which has had to do with the jettisoning of the True Mass and the imposition of its Caricature has reeked of mendacity, of conspiracy, of high-handed and heavy-handed arbitrariness. There has been nothing Catholic about it, nothing holy or beneficial. Every form of specious argumentation has been attempted, every form of trickery, and subterfuge. Dishonest scholarship, "court" theologians, and mistranslations—you name it! We shall come across a few examples of such things as we proceed.

Simultaneously, nothing has been omitted for the "education" (read "indoctrination") of the people: officious editorials in official papers, Episcopal commissions, programs of instruction, seminars, "practice masses," filmed demonstrations, clergy conferences, lectures by "liturgists," timetables and deadlines, posters and cartoons. The "Catholic" publishing industry seems to have been saved from bankruptcy turning out new missals and missalettes, treatises and apologies, analyses and explanations, for the "New Mass," all doing their unconvincing utmost to tell how wonderful it all is, how timely, how inspired. And, as far as I can tell, there has not come forth so much as a single line of simple beauty in the vast welter of it.

It goes without saying that, with all the effort, installing the "New Mass" was still quite a feat, and yet, really simple in its approach, when you get to the bottom of it. Everyone had to be deluded into thinking that the "New Mass" is really nothing but the True Mass somewhat changed, that it is simply a new "version" of the Mass, a new "rite." It is named the *Novus Ordo Missae*, the "New Arrangement of the Mass."

E. Pope Paul VI's Defense

Pope Paul VI has proved to be the chief and ablest propagandist of all, and the idea that the "New Mass" is the same as the True Mass has been his consistent theme. Let me quote at some length from one of his speeches. I will comment on various sentences. When you hear a pope speak, ordinarily, it never occurs to you to criticize his words. But in this instance, it is a necessity. (The contrast between Paul VI's style and mode of expression and that of former popes is so great as to be alarming in itself.)

> Beloved Sons and Daughters,
>
> We wish to draw your attention to an event about to occur in the Latin Catholic Church: the introduction of the liturgy of the new rite of the Mass. It will become obligatory in Italian dioceses from the First Sunday of Advent, this coming Sunday, which this year falls on November 30th (1969). The Mass will be celebrated in a rather different manner from that in which we have been accustomed to celebrate it *for the last four centuries, from the reign of St. Pius V, down to the present.*[26] [Italics mine]

Here is the misleading suggestion that Pope St. Pius V also brought out a "*novus ordo*."

> This change has something astonishing about it, something extraordinary. This because the Mass has been regarded as the traditional and untouchable expression of our religious worship and the authenticity of our faith.[26]

This is the teaching of St. Pius V and all his successors, and even Paul VI acknowledges the belief, though he contradicts it by his actions.

> It is asked, how could such a change be made? . . .It is due to the will expressed by the Ecumenical Council held not long ago. The Council decreed: "The rite of the Mass is to be revised in such a way that the intrinsic nature and purpose of its several parts, as also the connection between, can be more clearly manifested,

[26] Allocution of Pope Paul VI on November 26, 1969. "*La Documentation Catholique*." 7 December 1969.

> and that devout and active participation by the faithful can be more easily accomplished."[27]

Paul VI acts as if he is using the "New Mass" in obedience to the Second Vatican Council. This is a kind of buck-passing. He owes no obedience to this Council, if its decrees go counter to the laws of the Church, of which *Quo Primum* is one. Besides, it is *he* who promulgated its decrees; he is therefore really only obeying himself.

> The reform which is about to be brought into being is therefore a response to an authoritative mandate from the Church. It is an act of obedience. It is an act of coherence of the Church with herself. It is a step forward for her authentic tradition. It is a demonstration of fidelity and vitality, to which we all must give prompt assent.[27]

Note this paragraph carefully, for it is highly indicative. I will speak of it at length after making a few more comments. The suggestion is that all of us, hierarchy and people, are bound to accept the "New Mass" in response to the "authentic tradition" of the Church. Notice this typical "Pauline" manner of giving orders. You must admit it is strikingly different from that of Pope St. Pius V. There is certainly no tradition for this style of speaking either. It is another instance of "brotherhood" jargon: "Let's all do it because we are all going to do it." Let no one ever be deceived by the phrasing, however; it means the same thing in practice, if not canonically, as "We order, command, and decree, etc." Above, the Pope has mentioned that we were all under the impression that the immutability of the Rite of the Mass was

[27] *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, No. 50 (Ibid.)

a part of Catholic tradition. And where did this idea come from? From the Council of Trent, from Pope St. Pius V, and all his successors, of course, so that, clearly, the act of "altering" the Mass is not an adherence to Tradition, but a direct contradiction and violation of it.

> This reform puts an end to uncertainties, to discussions, to arbitrary abuses. It calls us back to that uniformity of rites and feeling proper to the Catholic Church. The heir and continuator of that first Christian community, which was all "one single heart and a single soul" (Acts 4:32).[27]

From the perspective here, this set of words is almost funny, in a maudlin kind of way, particularly for anyone who has attended one of these "New Masses" lately. Since the introduction of the "New Mass," all the Church has known has been "uncertainties," "discussions" (even during "mass"), and "arbitrary abuses," to put it mildly. But the most obvious question it evokes is the following: Does this mean that never may the Mass be changed again? *Pope St. Pius V tried the very same thing, and behold what is happening here!*

> The second question is: What exactly are the changes? You will see for yourselves that they consist of many new directions for celebrating the rites.[27]

Many priests seem to have seen only one "direction"—*optional!*

> But, let everyone understand well that nothing has been changed in the essence of our traditional Mass.[27]

I will say more about this later. Of course, the burden of this study is that the Traditional Mass has been discarded. Only

certain vestiges have been kept, so "as to deceive (if possible) even the elect" (Matthew 24:24).

> Some perhaps will have gotten the idea that by the introduction of such and such a ceremony, or such and such a rubric being added, that such things constitute or hide alterations or minimisations of defined truths or ideas sanctioned by the Catholic Faith.[27]

The fact that some have gotten—were bound to get—this idea is reason enough for the condemnation of the "Novus Ordo." It was exactly to prevent this ever happening that Pope St. Pius V forbade anyone to tamper with the *Missale Romanum*. Paul VI knew very well that *many already* had gotten the idea that the changes then contemplated were truly radical. For example, the following quotation comes from a study made under the sponsorship of Cardinals Ottaviani and Bacci, whose credentials need no certification:

> In October 1967 the Episcopal Synod, summoned in Rome, was asked for its opinion on the experimental celebration of so-called "normative Mass," thought out by the *Consilium ad Exequendam Constitutionem de Sacra Liturgia*. This Mass was viewed with the gravest doubts by those present at the Synod: in the vote taken, 43 out of 187 expressed strong opposition (*non placet*), 62 had substantial reservations (*juxta modum*), and 4 abstained. The international information press spoke of a "rejection" of the proposed Mass by the Synod, while the "progressive" press made no mention of the vote. A periodical, expressing the bishops' point of view and doctrine, epitomized the new rite as follows: "It would sweep away the whole theology of the Mass. With it we should, in fact, be getting close to protestant theology, which has destroyed the sacrifice of the Mass."

> Now, in the *Novus Ordo Missae*, which has just been promulgated by the Apostolic Constitution, the same "normative Mass" reappears in substantially identical form. And it seems that the Episcopal conferences as such have not been consulted in the interval.[28]

This important study under the sponsorship of Cardinals Ottaviani and Bacci (in the later references to be called simply *The Critique)* had a letter printed with it, wherein they say:

> The accompanying critical study is the work of a group of theologians, liturgists, and pastors of souls. Brief though it is, it sufficiently demonstrates that the *Novus Ordo Missae*—considering the new elements, susceptible of widely differing evaluations, which appear to be implied or taken for granted—represents, as a whole and in detail, a striking departure from the Catholic theology of The Holy Mass as it was formulated in Session XXII of the Council of Trent, which by fixing definitively the 'canons' of the rite erected an insurmountable barrier against any heresy which might attack the integrity of the Mystery.[29]

In answer to such views as these, the Pontiff gives the following explanation; I am quoting again from his speech cited above:

> But there is nothing in this idea, absolutely [the idea that some will suspect that the Mass is being changed radically, and its doctrine being disparaged]. First of all,

[28] "Roman Theologians Take a Look at the New Order of the Mass-A Sharp Critique." Ogilvie Foundation (Lumen Gentium). 3 Magdala Crescent, Edinburgh, Scotland. 1970. p.3. (A different translation appeared in *Triumph* Magazine under the title of "The Ottaviani Intervention." December, 1969.)
[29] Ibid. p. 27.

> because ritual and rubrics are not, in themselves, a matter of dogmatic definition. These can have a diversity of theological meanings depending on the liturgical context in which they occur.
>
> They are the gestures and terms attached to a religious action, an experience, lived and living, in the ineffable mystery of the Divine Presence, which is not always expressed in an identical way. Only theological criticism can analyze an action and find an expression for it in logically satisfying doctrinal formulas.
>
> Thus, with the new rite, the Mass is the same as always. If anything, its identity has been made more recognizable in certain of its aspects.[30]

This kind of talk beggars belief—except that it is characteristically "Pauline." In short, the Pope is saying: The Mass has no strictly defined ceremony, ritual, or formula. It is a kind of formless, spiritual essence, like a ghost (or something else invisible). It can only be seen when it is covered, and can be covered with first, this set of rites, then that. It does not really matter which set is used, although a set should be chosen which is expressive to the men of a given time-period. (A modernist notion if there ever was one!) Do I need to tell you that this strange language is totally foreign to all Catholic teaching? One is tempted to ask, what is this "theological criticism" business? Is there some kind of gnosis or special knowledge whereby the experts and the liturgists construe what shape the liturgy of the Mass ought to have? The whole idea is absurd! Anyone can see that, if it takes experts and liturgists to devise your "ritual" for you, you surely cannot describe their creations as traditional. Nor can you describe them as "ritual." For, obviously, the rites of any religion (true or man-made)

[30] Allocution of Paul VI on November 26, 1969. *La Documentation Catholique*. 7 December 1969.

must have taken their origin from its very beginning; they can only symbolize what they do through an historic relationship with what they recall and re-celebrate; and their traditional character derives from the fact that its adherents, for generations, have understood this relationship.

F. The "Authentic Tradition"

By now you should be getting a clear idea of the strategy with which the Catholic faithful were connived into accepting the legality of the "New Mass." We have seen how infallible the dogmatic content and how sacrosanct the rituals of the True Mass were seen to be in the days of the Council of Trent (and ever since, save for the past decade or so). The "reformers," under the (at least *visible*) leadership of Paul VI, have tried to throw the cloak of Tradition and of the Council of Trent over what they attempt to describe as a "new arrangement of the Mass" (Appendix II). While we "dumb sheep" have been thinking they meant only to make minor changes in the Mass, they have been replacing it, parts at a time, numbing our reactions with their incessant blathering about the divine urgency and auspiciousness of it all! Over a period of time, they have introduced something altogether different from the True Mass. And, even while they were making a mockery of the traditions and the laws of the Church with regard to the sacred liturgy, they have been vesting themselves with the legitimate authority to do so through constant, mendacious references to those traditions and laws. Therefore, now that they have installed their irreverent Imitation, they are able to claim that same immunity for themselves and their Imposture which applied to what they have (they hope) gotten rid

of. They now claim for *their* Mass that infallibility of doctrine, that venerability, that historicity of origin, and that holiness of essence, which two thousand years of Catholicism could not preserve for the True Mass against the likes of them.

Their most consistent argument has been that "one pope can countermand the decrees of a former one." They who began their insidious maneuver against every tradition, and particularly the traditions canonized by the Council of Trent, with their complaint of the "legalism" of these traditions, are now the most "legalistic" of all, to the point of sheerest despotism. They thought that, if they could justify what they meant to do, if they could make it look legal, they would be clear so no one could accuse them. What is this but more phariseism—using the law contrary to everything the law means and is meant to do? And, the most incredible aspect of it all—almost nobody seems to have perceived it, even now: IT IS SINFUL! IT IS A SACRILEGE!

In his Apostolic Constitution, *Missale Romanum*, Paul VI speaks in the same vein as in the allocution I have quoted, laboring as always to wreathe with the aura of authenticity and of Tradition his "*Novus Ordo*" and his Act of imposing it. We find therein the following passage:

> One ought not to think, however, that this revision of the Roman Missal has been improvident. The progress that the liturgical sciences have accomplished in the last four centuries has, without a doubt, prepared the way. After the Council of Trent, the study 'of ancient manuscripts of the Vatican library and of others gathered elsewhere,' as our predecessor St. Pius V indicated in the Apostolic Constitution *Quo Primum*, has greatly helped for the revision of the Roman Missal.

> Since then, however, *more ancient liturgical sources* have been discovered and published and at the same time liturgical formulas of the Oriental Church have become better known. Many wish that the riches, both Doctrinal and spiritual, might not be hidden in the darkness of the libraries, but on the contrary might be brought into the light to illumine and nourish the spirits and souls of Christians.[31]

I hate to be such a 'spoil-sport,' but you might as well know now as later, *there are not any* "more ancient liturgical sources" which will justify the "New Mass," as the arguments which follow will show. As you know, the evolutionists solve all their problems by losing their hypnotized little proselytes in the foggy, distant eons. Here we are being taken into the "darkness of the libraries," where only our guides can see. Such talk is only more of the same hyper-intellectualist eyewash of which we simpletons must stand in awe. You will just have to face the fact that there is no tradition whatsoever for the Thing known as the "New Mass;" any fledgling student of the liturgy can tell you as much. For example:

1. *There is no tradition allowing those not in Orders to perform special liturgical roles*. In the ancient Church, even he who locked and unlocked the church building and rang the bell had to have received the Order of Porter. The Lector was allowed to *chant* the "Lessons;" later on, the Subdeacon of the Mass was allowed to *sing* the Epistle, while the Deacon sang the Gospel. There is absolutely no tradition permitting women to speak in church; they could make only those responses assigned to the congregation. This practice was specifically noted by St. Paul in his First Letter to the

[31] Appendix II. Par. 4

Corinthians (1 Corinthians 14:34). Those who say the contrary are ready to contend even with him!

2. *There is no tradition of complete optionalism in liturgical matters.* From the very first, under the general supervision of the Apostles, custom governed everything in each church (1 Corinthians 11; 14:34–35). The constant tradition moved in the direction of ever greater uniformity, of ever more detailed rubrics; of taking the power to decide even the smallest things out of the hands, first of the local presbyter, then of the local ordinary (bishop or abbot), then of concentrating it in the hands of the pope personally.[32]

Those who say that every celebrant should be free to devise the liturgy of the day seem woefully ignorant of the fact that ours is called the "Roman Rite" because the people took pride that it derived from the practices of the Community in Rome, where the pope himself legislated and celebrated "the Mysteries." Practically the only optionalism there ever was had to do with the selection of readings. In the early days, the lessons were consecutive readings from the Old Testament and the Gospels and Epistles. The bishop would often have the ministers read particular passages as the subject of his homily.

3. *With regard to preaching, the tradition moved from the simple explanation of the Scriptures (homilies) and catechetical instruction (catechesis) to the sermon, the panegyric, and the elaborate discourse.* Some of the greatest orators of history have been Catholic bishops and priests. The idea of a mere unprepared "talk," much less a "dialogue" or a little chit-chat, is so foreign to Catholic (or any religious) tradition as to be ludicrous. I might add, throughout the history of sacred oratory even Orthodoxy was insufficient; *that* was taken for granted. Not only did

[32] Encyclical Letter *Mediator Dei* of Pope Pius XII November 20, 1947. Par. 58.

the preacher have to be able to speak well, but he was expected to expound ably, persuasively, and with edification. (One shudders to think what might have happened to a priest who babbled in the presence of St. Paul the way some of ours do today!)

4. *There is no tradition which allows those of other "faiths," those who may or may not believe in Christ as the Eternal High Priest and the Divine Victim of the Holy Sacrifice, to participate in the liturgy.* The further back you go in history, the stricter you find the rules to have been. The ancient practice was to require all who did not have the Faith, all who were not baptized into the True Faith, to leave before the Creed. Only catechumens were allowed to stay till then; unbelievers were not allowed at all. Nor were those who had committed grave public sins, or who had incurred censures, nor those obliged to do pubic penance. (This is one practice which might very well be restored.)

5. *There is no tradition for presuming "good will" on the part of unbelievers.* There is a very constant tradition for praying for them that they might be delivered from their spiritual blindness. There is also a very constant tradition for trying to convert them. There is also a very constant tradition recognizing that Judaism is Talmudism, and that Talmudism is essentially anti-Christian.

6. *There is no tradition for permitting any kind of sound which some quasi-educated artiste might find "music to his ears."* In this respect, the tradition definitely moved toward the development of Gregorian Chant, which became the recognized perfect accompaniment for sung Latin. If we wanted to be "purist" about it, we would remember that, due to an ingrained sobriety, the Roman Rite would prefer no accompanying instrument at all; the organ would be permitted only because many cannot sing on key.

7. *There is no tradition of casualness in the liturgy of any Catholic Rite*. In fact there is no tradition of casualness in the religious ritual of any group in the world, no matter how pagan, how primitive, or how polytheistic. Reverential fear is the most elemental attitude of anything which purports to be worship. That attitude which dares to treat with God familiarly, as an equal, as Someone Who is even *approachable*, derives from the tradition of anti-religious Rationalism. Its origins are and always have been anti-Christian, anti-religious. To the very contrary, the most constant tradition of the Church has always moved in the direction of ever greater formality, born of tremulous awe. Indeed, the essential meaning of ritual includes sobriety, reverence, carefulness, fidelity to prescribed procedures and laws (which are nothing but hallowed customs made obligatory), a sense of unworthiness in the presence of the Almighty, a sense of wonder at being allowed to come into His Sanctuary, to speak to Him, to touch Him. One of the unique contributions of Christianity to worship in general is the addition of a most restrained "gaiety" to this reverential fear, plus a serene confidence of divine benevolence.

The reason why contemporary heretics presume to abandon these modes is that they have lost all awareness of and respect for Tradition, as they have lost all fear of God, and they think it a sign of maturity, progress, and freedom to have done so. The truth is, they don't even know what ritual is! They are possessed with the spirit of Revolution, which has proved to be more than they can handle.

8. *There is no tradition in the Church for adaptation of the divine rites to the times*. Those who argue this do not know what they are talking about. Besides, what has been called "adaptation" in the "modern Church" is addle-brained. What is being attempted is the forming of a religion out of the so-called

modern spirit, which, in the first place, is not modern, and in the second, is not at all Christian. It is rationalistic, naturalistic, and Revolutionary. The "modern" spirit cannot possibly be adopted by Catholicism nor interpreted into its liturgy, any more than could Judaism or Greek mythology or Hindu polytheism. Bad enough that we must listen to such drivel; we must even *endure* the clumsy, abortive effort—and call it "mass"!

You can see from these very few examples that there is neither consistency nor Tradition in the so-called reform. One could go on and on in this vein, but the above should be sufficient.

G. The Roman Rite and Antiquarianism

The great "renewal" of the Mass was executed under the guise of a "return to the liturgy of the Early Church." This was sheerest trickery, made more incongruous by the incessant fulminations about bringing the Church "up-to-date." To accomplish this "renewal," a thousand years of tradition, of doctrinal development, of Catholic culture and spirituality had to be denied. This denial amounted to saying that the liturgy of the diocese of Rome from the most elementary beginnings to the time of say, Gregory the Great (590–604), was the era of true Christianity—in short, it *was* Catholicism (though this word seems to send these "modernists" into near frenzy). From the latter time up to and including the Council of Trent, everything was error, aberration, and accretion. The "reform" must, therefore, consist in the expurgation from the liturgy—and, necessarily, from the entire Catholic religion—of every trace and contribution of what might be loosely referred to as the Middle Ages (the "Age of Faith," as this era has been rightly called). The first and obvious effect of this "simplification"

maneuver has been to deprive the Mass of precisely those rites which so undeniably enhance its beauty and which have inspired the devotion of the faithful from the time of their incorporation until this very day. To describe these ceremonies as "medieval" is in no way to derogate them, but merely to tell the time of their appearance. No one who has a genuine appreciation of the Roman liturgy is disdainful of the Middle Ages, as many nowadays think it learned to be. The comment of Edmond Bishop which follows may be of some help in getting these considerations in their proper perspective:

> The history of the liturgy during the later middle ages is simply and merely a history of an attempt (and a successful attempt) to accommodate the native Roman books and rites to the more devout, or effusive, or imaginative, genius of the nations which had one and all adopted them; and of the admission of these changes to a greater or less extent by Rome or Roman Curia, giving them thereby for the benefit of posterity the authority of the Roman name. It was in the course of these ages that the rite was enriched with a dramatic element which it had hitherto so greatly lacked. It was then that, subjected to this influence, actions were so largely added, expressive of the words used in the service; or prayers were introduced (as, for instance, during the whole of the offertory in our present order of mass) which should correspond to each detail of the actions performed. Practically at that time there was, strictly speaking no Roman rite left to follow. The pope was very commonly, from the beginning of the twelfth century, absent from Rome; the Papal Chapel might be anywhere; and the observance of the churches in Rome itself sank, whilst the offices performed in the majestic Gothic Cathedrals, now rising on every side were ever

> increasing in dignity and splendor. This was the epoch of the formation of a rite that may not inaptly be called Romano-French, almost the last relics of which have disappeared in our own day, unless, indeed, the compound called 'Lyons-Roman' can be regarded as a survival. This Romano-French rite was possessed of just those qualities of picturesque and interesting elaboration in which the native Roman rite was so notably deficient; it is this rite which has excited to so large an extent that admiration and the interest of those who have occupied themselves with the historical study of liturgy in the past two generations.[33]

By the time of the Council of Trent and Pope St. Pius V, there was need for a reform, not of the liturgical book so much as of the practices of the churches:

> Taking a survey of western Europe as a whole, it was in much the same condition of liturgical anarchy as that in which Charles the Great (Charlemagne) had found his own realm some eight centuries before. The Roman rite was the only one in use, except in the province of Milan; but each church or diocese had modified it at discretion. There was, in fact of recent movements, need once more of setting up a norm or type, and one somewhat more simple, to which the various local churches should conform. Then, as eight centuries before in practice only one rite presented itself as possible for the general adoption—viz. that of the local Church of Rome.[34]

[33] *Liturgical Historica*, Edmund Bishop, University Press, Oxford, 1918 & 1962. p. 16.
[34] Ibid. p. 17

The reform of St. Pius V, then, was not the issuance of a new rite of the Mass, as intimated by Paul VI in an earlier passage, but a reform of discipline, and that, as Mr. Bishop says, for the sake of order and orthodoxy. Nor was it an attempt to re-institute the liturgy of the Roman Church of a thousand years previous; it was rather the establishment of a single definitive form and the binding of churches in the Roman Rite to adhere to it. Mr. Bishop considers this a fortunate thing.

> Fortunately, in accordance with a trait of the Roman character, the new settlement of the Roman books, made in accordance with the desire of the Council of Trent, was based on existing practice without any elaborate antiquarian investigation whether that practice was due to foreign influence, or how far it was of genuine Roman origin. As a fact, some ancient manuscripts then in the Vatican Library were examined preparatory to settling the text of the missal put forth by St. Pius V; but, fortunately, I repeat, these were not of an earlier date than the eleventh or twelfth century, and were books which issued from the union of the Gregorian, or true Roman, missal with the compilation made in France by the direction of Charles the Great towards the close of the eighth century.[34]

Warning of the pretext for change on the basis of antiquarianism, Pope Pius XII in His Encyclical letter *Mediator Dei* wrote:

> The same reasoning holds in the case of some persons who are bent on the restoration of all the ancient rites and ceremonies indiscriminately. The liturgy of the early ages is most certainly worthy of all

veneration. But ancient usage must not be esteemed more suitable and proper, either in its own right or in its significance for later times and new situations, on the simple ground that it carries the savor and aroma of antiquity. The more recent liturgical rites likewise deserve reverence and respect. They too owe their inspiration to the Holy Spirit, Who assists the Church in every age even to the consummation of the world (Matthew 28:20). They are equally the resources used by the majestic spouse of Jesus Christ to promote and procure the sanctity of men."

Assuredly it is a wise and most laudable thing to return in spirit and affection to the sources of the sacred liturgy. For research in this field of study, by tracing it back to its origins, contributes valuable assistance towards a more thorough and careful investigation of the significance of feast-days, and of the meaning of the texts and sacred ceremonies employed on their occasion. But it is neither wise nor laudable to reduce everything to antiquity by every possible device. Thus, to cite some instances, one would be straying from the straight path were he to wish the altar restored to its primitive table-form; were he to want black excluded as a color for the liturgical vestments; were he to forbid the use of sacred images and statues in churches; were he to order the crucifix so designed that the Divine Redeemer's Body shows no trace of His cruel sufferings.

Clearly no sincere Catholic can refuse to accept the formulation of Christian doctrine more recently elaborated and proclaimed as dogmas by the Church, under the inspiration and guidance of the Holy Spirit with abundant fruit for souls, because it pleases him to hark back to the old formulas…Just as obviously unwise and mistaken is the zeal of one who in matters liturgical, would go back to the rites and usage of

> antiquity, discarding the new patterns introduced by disposition of Divine Providence to meet the changes of circumstances and situation.[35]

You will observe that, as of the year 1958, Paul VI, then Archbishop of Milan, was in full agreement with this teaching of his predecessor. Witness the following:

> Rebirth means newness, and this concept obliges us to specify what kind of newness we mean, avoiding two dangerous and opposed innovating tendencies.
>
> The first would be that of attempting a purely archaic restoration.
>
> This tendency involves a belief that only the ancient forms of worship are the good and authentic forms; a denial of legitimate historical transformations, vital enrichments and prudent adaptations to the development of worship.[36]

Pope Pius XII was undoubtedly aware of the fact that there were some among the liturgical "antiquarians" whose devotion for the sacred liturgy and the Early Church was mere pretense. We are the benighted witnesses and victims of this fact, now that those true intentions have been made all but inescapable in the "New Mass." For, the "New Mass" is no more than restoration of the Mass of the ancient church of Rome than it is an "up-to-date" version of the "Mass of St. Pius V." It is rather a mocking take-off on both; a fabrication so completely different and distinct from either, that one has reason to be amazed the Catholic world has stood still for this outrage. For they were both the True Mass, the one an earlier and recognizable form of the other; the later a true, logical, and

[35] *Mediator Dei.* Pars. 61, 62, 63.

[36] "Liturgical Formations." Paul VI. Worship. 1958, Vol. 33, No.3. p. 145

worthy derivation of the former. The True Mass is an organic whole that grew from the seed of its beginning into what we know today, without any change in its nature and with a very clear relationship of the various parts to the whole, as the limbs of a plant to the trunk; the "New Mass" is an imitation organism, quite dead, made up of artificial parts manufactured from synthetic materials, and put together with an evil genius, for the purpose of deceiving its viewers. But the "New Mass" will not sustain close scrutiny without revealing its inorganic, non-viable, and purely fabricated nature.

Chapter Four

The "New Mass" of Baal

Nevertheless send now, and gather unto me all Israel, unto mount Carmel, and the prophets of Baal four hundred and fifty, and the Prophets of the groves four hundred, who eat at Jezabel's table.

3 Kings 18:19

One can analyze the "New Mass" properly only by comparing it with that which its creators claim it is, the Mass of the Roman Rite. When Catholics now go to "mass," their habit is to see what is not there. *The reason is, they have all but forgotten the True Mass, and what they see is a resemblance of it.* They read meanings into words which the words they hear do not say, while they fail to advert to what the words do say. In this way, the real objectives of the "vernacular movement" are realized. It does not occur to the faithful that their children, not having the mental background they do, are better able to see the thing as it is, for they see only what is there, and hear only the words which are spoken. The people do not wish to awaken to what has happened (and is still happening). They live in a fictitious world, and they resent any effort to jolt them out of it. Such an awakening would cause them a great problem, a great host of problems, every kind of friction, inconvenience, and readjustment. And it would impose such noisome burdens.

While the True Mass was being withdrawn from them, the people watched and endured it helplessly, uncomprehendingly, resignedly. And all the while it was being done, they were being "re-educated": on the one hand, while the True Mass was being hidden from view, erased from their memory, every kind of irreverent, pseudo-liturgical, and specious criticism was being made against it by their clerical indoctrinators; on the other hand, as the parts of the Replacement were being eased in, various and sundry equally implausible rationalizations were being pumped into their bewildered brains. Those who showed mistrust and suspicion or who raised objections were subjected to withering scorn. Even now, most Catholics are unaware of the immeasurable dissimilarity between the True Mass and its perfidious Plagiarism. They really think that the main differences are a change in language and the turning around of the altar. Three other factors contributed to their subversion. For one thing, the language of the "New Mass" sounds truly pious and prayerful. For another, everything about the "new religion" is decidedly easier, pleasanter, friendlier, more casual—and, at times, simply great fun! And most insidious of all is the argument that the changes are good if you like them. "If you like them!" This means you are praying better. If the new way makes you *feel* better, your worship is bound to *be* better. The one question never allowed was whether God approves of this "New Religion." Of course, it does not matter, for "The People is Baal."

We will observe how much of the True Mass was completely thrown aside. Indeed, only the spindliest skeleton of the Mass was kept and fragments of some few prayers. And even these were so rephrased and distorted that anyone should be able to recognize the fiendish malice of the "formulators." All was done with the deliberate intention of deceiving the faithful; of destroying their faith; of disposing them of all sense of

reverence, all sense of "the Holy" (*desacralization* is the "reformers'" word for it); and of slyly inculcating the tenets of the "New Religion" at the same time. This is not to mention the rascals' own need to vent their blasphemous attitude toward what they were secretly and cynically mocking and their satanic delight at seeing us to take to it like drinkers after a bottle. So artificial is the "New Mass" that, upon studying it, one would judge it was drafted by shady characters with scratch-pads huddled around a table. (The same can be said of the other ritualistic recipes with which we are being regaled almost monthly.)

It seems neither necessary nor advisable to attempt a line-by-line analysis of the "New Mass." We shall be looking at the Latin version from the point of its structure. But since Latin is almost never used, some attention must be given to certain of the prayers in their English "translations." When we come to the "Consecration" part of this unbelievable Curio, we must look at both the Latin and the English forms because, problematical as the Latin is, the English is worse. The following is the way we have divided the study:

A. Expurgations
B. Mistranslations
C. The Changing of the Canon
D. The New Form of Consecration:
   1. The Epiclesis and the Form of Consecration
   2. "*Mysterium Fidei*"
   3. "*Haec Quotiescumque*"
   4. "*Pro Multis*"
E. Validity and Liceity
F. The Dishonoring of Mary
G. The Purpose of Archaism
H. The Rite of Peace

I. The "Communion"
J. "Ecumenism"
K. The Language of the "New Mass"

A. Expurgations

If you will simply find yourself an old missal and turn to the Ordinary of the Mass, you will easily see how many prayers and rites have been eliminated in the "New Mass." You will remember that with each such elimination a very recondite and plausible reason was given why it should be made. By now you have probably forgotten the reasons you were given; but, you see, now that the excisions have been made, the reasons make no difference anymore.

All the Prayers at the Foot of the Altar, including the "ascental" Psalm (42), were replaced. The *Aufer a Nobis* was dropped for the same reason; namely, since there is no altar, one cannot "go up" to it. And since there is no tabernacle, there can be no mention of the "Holy of Holies." Since saints, and above all, martyrs, are not thought too highly of in the "New Church," there is no call for the *Oramus Te* being kept. Also found objectionable were the prayers *Munda Cor Meum* and the *Dominus Sit*; these were private prayers of the priest, and private prayer during the communal exercise is not to be tolerated.

Practically all the prayers of the Offertory, one of the principal parts of the True Mass, were deemed useless, which means that the following six prayers are not to be found in the "*Novus Ordo*": the *Suscipe Sancte Pater*, the *Deus qui Humanae*, the *Offerimus Tibi*, the V*eni Sanctificator*, the *Lavabo* (Ps. 25), and the *Suscipe Sancta Trinitas*. As mere tokens, the prayers *In Spiritu Humilitatis* and *Orate Fratres* were kept.

The given reason for this incredible exspoliation is that all these prayers are recent insertions into the Mass; none of them were in the Mass before, say, 1100 or 1200 A.D. Obviously we cannot let any prayers a mere eight or nine hundred years old into our "renewed" prayer service!

To help you understand the real reasons why this whole collection of excellent orisons is totally irreconcilable with the "New Faith," let us analyze one as an example. Consider the prayer which the priest says in the True Mass as he raises the host on the paten toward heaven, the *Suscipe Sancte Pater*. Read this prayer slowly and see if you can find anything wrong with it. To help you, I suggest you make your judgment on the basis of these three questions: Is there anything here which is contrary to the Catholic Religion? Is there anything here which would offend a non-Catholic were he to read it? Lastly, can you perceive anything herein which reveals that this prayer is improper for these exciting days of the "seventies"?

Suscipe Sancte Pater:

> Receive, O holy Father, almighty and eternal God, this spotless host, which I, thy unworthy servant, offer unto Thee, my living and true God, for mine own countless sins, offenses and negligences, and for all here present; as also for all faithful Christians living and dead, that it may avail both for my own and their salvation unto everlasting life. Amen.[37]

Can you tell me now what is wrong with this prayer that it should not be allowed in the Mass, even to be said silently by the priest? Well, may I tell you that there is *everything*

[37] *St. Andrew Daily Missal*. The E. M. Lohmann Co., St. Paul, Minn 1937 & 1951. All translations of the *Missale Romanum* of Pope St. Pius V are taken from this edition.

wrong with this prayer! To begin with, it was said *silently* by the celebrant, and silent prayers are decidedly outlawed in the "*Novus Ordo.*" What is more, this prayer is spoken in the first person singular—it has the pronoun *ego* ("I") in it. Now, if there are two things which we cannot abide in the "new age," it is silent prayers during the communal prayer service, and the priest's acting as if he were about to do something in virtue of his own priesthood, which the laity cannot participate in.

Here is an open and tactless admission that he fully intends to offer a sacrifice. Does he really think by whispering his prayer in Latin our "separated brethren" will not find out? And once they do, that will be the last we shall see them!

Besides this, the priest suggests he is "*unworthy*" to offer the Mass; in the "New Religion" *everyone* is "worthy." His mentioning his "countless sins, transgressions and failings," suggests there is such a thing as sin, which, as you know, is highly suggestive of a guilt-complex. Very out of place.

Then there is this special attention given to "all faithful Christians," which means some are being left out of consideration—very uncharitable. He even mentions those faithful Christians who are dead. This smacks very loudly of a belief in the doctrine of Purgatory—very offensive to any Protestants present.

Finally, there is the mention of "salvation unto everlasting life." This is an out-and-out reference to *Heaven*; whereas it is not at all certain whether there is a Heaven. That whole matter is still under discussion. And what's more, suppose a Jew should happen to be in attendance—a direct slap at him.

Now do you see what is wrong with this prayer? I am beginning to think you need to go to one of your parish CCD classes and get yourself "up-dated."

So much for the prayer *Suscipe Sancte Pater*, and this is only one of six prayers which have been eradicated with the almost complete dropping of the Offertory of the Mass.

In the part of the Mass called the Canon, there are six prayers before the Consecration: the *Te Igitur*, the *Memento Domine*, the *Communicantes*, the *Hanc Igitur*, the *Quam Oblationem*, and the *Qui Pridie*. And there are seven which follow it: the *Unde et Memores*, the *Supra Quae Propitio*, the *Supplices Te Rogamus*, the *Memento Etiam*, the *Nobis quoque Peccatoribus*, the *Per Quem haec Omnia*, and the *Per Ipsum*.

You might never have thought of the matter this way, but whenever the priest does not choose to recite "Eucharistic Prayer, Form Number One," all thirteen of these prayers are thereby omitted. This means his "mass" has no Canon at all. Since there are four so-called "Eucharistic Prayers," this probably happens at least three out of four times the "New Mass" is "said."

But this is not the end of it. The translation of these prayers into the vernacular is so garbled that even when "Eucharistic Prayer, Form Number One" is used, it is still nothing but an inept paraphrase. Thus, when one speaks of "Eucharistic Prayer, Form Number One," he should not refer to it as the "Canon of the Mass," but as he would "Eucharistic Prayer, Forms Number Two, Three, and Four," that is, as "inventions." We shall explain the significance of this "change of the Canon" in a special section a little further on.

Following the *Pater Noster* (which the infiltrators have done their utmost to get their defiling hands on), are the prayers which comprise the Communion of the Mass. Those which have been dispatched are the *Libera Nos*, the *Panem Coelestem*, the priest's *Domine non sum Dignus*, the Q*uid Retribuam*, the second *Confiteor* of the people with the two following absolutions, the two repetitions of the people's invocation,

Domine non sum Dignus, the *Corpus Domini*, the *Quod Ore*, the *Corpus Tuum*, the *Placeat Tibi*, and the *Last Gospel* –which make ten in all.

Counting conservatively and conceding for the sake of the argument that "Eucharistic Prayer Form Number One" is the "Roman Canon," when it is replaced by one of the other "Eucharistic Prayers," a grand total of thirty-five prayers, or seventy percent, are thereby discarded from the Ordinary of the Traditional Mass. *Seven-tenths of the prayers of the Mass are gone!* Nor is this to mention the many brief versicles and responses with which the True Mass abounds—all summarily dropped in the "New Mass."

Also banned, by my reckoning, were twenty-five Signs of the Cross, twelve genuflections, and many lesser acts of reverence; first to the tabernacle (which is often gone also), second to the crucifix (likewise), third to the Sacred Species, and fourth at the pronunciation of the Names of Christ and the Blessed Virgin Mary and the Saints. These acts of reverence include bows of the head, elevation of the eyes, kisses of the altar stone and its relics, turnings toward the tabernacle and the crucifix, and the subdued tone of the voice. Abrogated also is the "ritual of the hands" whereby the celebrant by various positionings and gestures signifies the thought of the prayers he is reciting. It would be possible to write an essay on the consequences of such a suppression as this alone.

Having hands, the priest must do something with them. Now that he is not directed to do anything with them, the "ceremony"—and those who must watch him—are at the mercy of his mannerisms, his inspirations, his indiscipline, his disinterest, his imagination, or whatever. Whereas, in the True Mass, with his hands, the priest adds, as it were, another dimension to the utterance of the prayer. The rubrics of the *Missale Romanum* require that the celebrant avoid touching

anything except the Sacred Host with "canonical fingers"—the thumb and index fingers of both hands—from the time of the Consecration onward to the final ablution. (His hands were anointed at Ordination with this very rubric in mind.) Each time he removes or replaces the pall, and each time he opens or closes the tabernacle, every time he even moves from one place to another while the Blessed Sacrament is present on the altar, the priest is bidden to genuflect. But all such rubrics are outmoded in the "*Novus Ordo*." Gone too are the ablutions of the fingers and the sacred vessels after communion, which betokened and bespoke to all those present that proximity of the all-holy Lord of the universe.

Lay people may be unaware of the fact that every action of the priest, every word, is a matter of rubric in the "old" *Missale Romanum*. From the beginning to the end of Mass, there is no time which does not follow a direction as to whether he is to stand, kneel, or sit, whether to hold his hands apart, rest them on the Missal, or on the altar, or to fold them, whether to whisper or to speak aloud, whether to face the tabernacle or the book or the people. At one time he is to nod his head slightly; at another he is to bow more deeply; at still another he is to bend over profoundly. I suppose few people have ever seen a Traditional Mass at which the celebrant adhered with exactness to the all but countless rubrical prescriptions, since most priests used to grow careless about them a few years after their elevation to the altar. These rubrics are there, nonetheless, and if a priest obey them, religiously and piously, with a sense of their sacramental meaning, he finds that they have a most beneficial influence on him, assisting his recollection, purifying his intentions and regulating his demeanor.

The entire foregoing, remember, has been an enumeration of those things which have been excised from the Mass. Now recall these words of Pope Paul VI, spoken on the 19th of

November, 1969, just eleven days before the "*Novus Ordo*" was introduced in Italy:

> But, let everyone understand well that nothing has been changed in the essence of our traditional Mass. Some perhaps will get the idea that by the introduction of such and such a ceremony, or the addition of such and such a rubric, that such things constitute or hide alterations of minimizations of defined truths or ideas sanctioned by the Catholic Faith. But there is nothing in this idea, absolutely. First of all, because ritual and rubrics are not, in themselves, a matter of dogmatic definition.[38]

Can you believe it? Some thirty-five prayers, all of which have been repeated tirelessly and lovingly by countless priests, great and ordinary, throughout the whole world, for well over a thousand years—whose origins, indeed, even the sophisticated science of this century has not discovered—whose exquisiteness of expression inspired the world's greatest artists, Catholic and non-Catholic, and whose mystical profundity were the meditations of the saints, and whose doctrinal phrasing served to catechize the faithful as well as to perfect their praise—these and the countless reverences, symbols, and gestures which accompanied and interpreted them are about to be stricken from a ceremony which ordinarily lasts hardly more than thirty minutes. And we are being told that it will be done without any essential change resulting in the act itself. In fact, in the above quotation there is no mention that any prayers will be removed at all, only "ritual and rubrics!" Now, if some nobody like myself were to say a similar thing while in the process of doing something like this, my integrity would be called into serious question, would it not?

[38] Allocution of Paul VI on November 19, 1969, "*La Documentation Catholique*." 7 December 1969

B. Mistranslations

> *Thou shalt not live: because thou hast spoken a lie in the Name of the Lord.*
>
> Zachary 13:3

It serves no purpose for anyone to try dissociating the Latin "*Novus Ordo*" from its vernacular versions. The "New Mass" is one unified thing, one "ball of wax," as they say. This fact can be deduced from the following evidence:

a) There is perfect correspondence between the rites of the "*Novus Ordo*" and the errors in the translations.

b) There is little reason to quarrel with the translations, except where the Latin retained from the "Old Mass" is concerned, which is to say, the "new" Latin is as insipid as are the translations of it.

c) For all their faultiness and angularity, the translations are not the result of ignorance but of connivery; the charlatans who produced them made sure that certain ideas were not lost in the crossover.

d) There is great consistency in the errors among the various languages.

It was never expected that the "New Mass" would be "said" in Latin to any great extent; the very idea is contrary to the "New Religion." To obscure responsibility for the action, the mechanics of the plot required that its composition be assigned to various hands, just as its introduction had to be spread over a period of time and its imposition worked out in stages. But despite the apparent collaborate authorship of the "New Mass", it possesses an essential unity, which is easily discernible. Two most important conclusions follow from this fact: First, the principal responsibility for the whole sacrilegious villainy

must ultimately be attributed to the presently-reigning Supreme Pontiff. Secondly, those who imagine that they keep their hands clean of the Great Sacrilege by using the Latin of the "*Novus Ordo*", or even "attending" it, are deluding themselves.

Lest anyone accuse me of giving all the perfidious foxes who have done all this mischief *too much* credit, let me say: in carrying out the Program, there has been a good deal of bungling, and one cannot claim that they have always kept that coolheadedness and sustained that audacity which Revolutionaries are taught are most essential for the game. They have not gotten away with it yet, you know; they have done some clumsy work and set off alarms all along the way. The most conspicuous evidence of their club-footedness has been their inability to render either "new" or "old" Latin into any language to the satisfaction of even the semi-literate. One could almost say that, were it not for their fidelity to their own subversive tenets, it would not be clear whether they knew either Latin or the vernacular.

The "reformers" have left us in their despicable Effigy but a misshapen remnant of the Traditional Catholic Mass. It is a credit to their skill as carvers that they have been able to mutilate the Mass completely and still have something with which to deceive the people. Two main artifices were employed in this butchery. One was the very liberal use of mistranslation. The other was the retention of certain "innocuous" words and ideas which we, their dupes, were accustomed to. These two tools were used simultaneously, one in each hand.

In the "New Mass," for example, there is what is called the "Penitential Rite." Most people take this as a slightly altered form of the *Confiteor*, simply reduced to a comfortable brevity. Let me quote the *Confiteor* alongside the new "Confession":

Confiteor:

Celebrant:

I confess to almighty God, to Blessed Mary ever Virgin, to blessed Michael the archangel, to blessed John the Baptist, to the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, to all the saints, and to you brethren, that I have sinned exceedingly in thought, word and deed, through my fault, through my fault, through my most grievous fault. Therefore, I beseech blessed Mary ever Virgin, blessed Michael the Archangel, blessed John the Baptist, the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, all the saints, and you, brethren, to pray to the Lord our God for me.

Server (or ministers):

May almighty God have mercy upon thee, forgive thee thy sins, and bring thee to life everlasting.

Celebrant: Amen.

Server: I confess etc...

Celebrant:

May almighty God have mercy upon you, forgive you your sins, and bring you to live everlasting.

Server: Amen.

Celebrant:

May the almighty and merciful Lord grant you pardon, absolution and remission of your sins.

Server: Amen.

"Confession"

All:

I confess to almighty God, and to you, my brothers and sisters, that I have sinned through my own fault in my thoughts and in my words, in what I have done, and in what I have failed to do; and I ask blessed Mary, ever virgin, all the angels and saints, and you, my brothers and sisters, to pray for me to the Lord our God.

Celebrant:

May almighty God have mercy on us, forgive us our sins, and bring us to everlasting life.

People: Amen.

Now, instead of first the priest, then the people making their confession of sinfulness to God, the Blessed Mary ever Virgin, the great St. Michael, the Apostles, and all the other saints in Heaven, the emphasis has been deftly shifted. And I assure you this was not done merely for the sake of efficiency. If you know anything about the "theology" of the "New Religion," you perceive how the true nature of sin has been subtly recast. (As I said before, reflect how your children understand these things. Or, what would be better, quiz them a bit.) The brevity serves to diminish the importance of the idea of sin altogether. But it is the repetition of the phrase, "you, my brothers and sisters," which must be noted. For in the "New Religion" the evil of sin abides in its offensiveness to one's fellow man. And, to finish the thought, if an act does not hurt him, it is not sinful at all; if it helps him, it is virtue.

Consider now these two renderings of the *Gloria*:

Correct Translation	*The New Rendering*
Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace to men of good will.	Glory to God in the highest, and peace to His people on earth.
We praise Thee. We bless Thee. We adore Thee. We glorify Thee. We give thanks to Thee for Thy great glory. O Lord God, heavenly King, God the Father Almighty.	Lord God, heavenly King, almighty God and Father, we worship you, we give you thanks, we praise you for your glory.
O Lord, the only-begotten Son, Jesus Christ. O Lord God, Lamb of God, Son of the Father.	Lord Jesus Christ, only Son of the Father, Lord God, Lamb of God, you take away the sin of the world: have mercy on us; you are seated at the right hand of the Father: receive our prayer.
Thou who takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us. Thou Who takest away	For you alone are the Holy One, you Alone are the Lord, you alone are the Most High,

the sins of the world, receive our prayer. Thou who sittest at the right hand of the Father, have mercy upon us.

For Thou only are holy, Thou only art the Lord; Thou only, O Jesus Christ, art most high. With the Holy Ghost, ✠ in the glory of God the Father. Amen.

Jesus Christ, with the Holy Spirit, in the glory of God the Father. Amen.

If you compare these two translations, your first reaction might be: There is very little difference between them. The new rendering is shorter; just a few words are left out. Why should anyone get excited about such minor divergences?

But the question is, why was the correct translation not kept? There is surely nothing wrong with it. Would it not have been easier to choose an exact translation? What possible reason might have motivated the choice of a translation which is obviously inaccurate? Perhaps as we proceed, you will realize that mistranslations in the sacred liturgy are a more serious matter than is immediately evident.

The reason the correct translation was not employed in the English versions of the "New Mass" is that mistranslations have uses of their own, as far as the plotters are concerned. You might even say they are absolutely necessary in the general Program.

First of all, it was necessary from the very beginning that the translations be "a bit free." This would give the impression that exactness was not at all necessary. Thus, the renderings of certain prayers containing doctrinal and other kinds of discrepancies might be slipped in with no fuss being made. Perfect examples are ready at hand in the English translations of the *Credo*, another "vestige" of the True Mass, and the

Consecration Form, the latter of which we will speak of further on. With regard to the *Credo*, contrary to the Latin sense, the first person singular was turned into the first person plural, from "I" to "we". *Credo* means "I believe." The original idea (and preparation) for this came no doubt from Pope Paul's Creed, pronounced most solemnly at the end of the "Year of Faith" (1967–1968). It contained "we believe" throughout. The Revolution's detestation for the individual person, with a mind and a will and an eternal destiny of his own, with a personal faith and a divinely-imposed obligation to profess it publicly and to express it in prayer, is here manifested and unmistakably indoctrinated, *this by the device of one little word.*

Another purpose served by mistranslation in the "New Rite" is to make prayers in the Mass, such as the *Gloria*, negligible and unimportant in the minds of all, so that they can be discarded effortlessly or omitted at his whim, by the "president." Obviously if the Church does not care enough to see that its official prayers are correctly translated, it could not matter much whether they are said or not. Our "presidents" have taken the hint and now act accordingly. In the "old dispensation," it was considered at least a venial sin to omit or alter without good reason any of the prayers of the Mass. To do so as a matter of course was considered serious.

More important than such considerations as these is the immediate and obvious one that here is a falsity in the most holy Action in which men may have a share, the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. Here, of all places, is a shameless violation of the virtue, of veracity, an implicit insult to God, an abuse of the trust of the people, most of whom, through no fault of their own, have no notion that such tricks are being played, they being under the quaint misapprehension that the Pope, the bishops, and their parish priests are men of honor. Even *one* such mis-rendering is cause for alarm, and

the new vernacular "versions" are rife with this kind of thing, from beginning to end.

No possible excuse can be found for such breaches as this, yet the pietistic clergy of the "New Church" cannot be bothered in the least about them. Since the first of these garblings appeared, complaints have been made to the Vatican, which has been too busy and noisy about the further steps of the Revolution to be able to hear them. If one should ask his bishop whether *he* has ever made an issue of this matter at one of those much publicized and very scandalous bishops' meetings, he will blink his eyes, clear his throat, recover his aplomb, and brush off your question as if you were a neurotic and assure you that you can leave such things in his and his colleagues' capable hands: "Trust in me, my child." If you ask your parish "president" why it is that the bishops have not succeeded in finding anyone between Rome and here who can turn the simplest Latin into plain and honest English, he will be ready to give you one of a dozen stock specious arguments, all of which betray his supercilious disdain for your innocence and faint-heartedness. His large-hearted devotion rises above such trifles as this: when he "offers mass," he is "wrapped in God."

The irony of all is that the "New Mass" was imposed on us with the excuse that "scholarship" had been able to restore the Mass to a purer, truer, and simpler form. Here is a typical example of this "scholarship"; these egg-headed savants cannot even see any difference between "peace to men of good will": and "peace to his people." I am no scholar but I know the Revolutionary connotation of such a phrase as the latter. In the language of the Revolution, "peace" means that situation when all opposition to the "new order" has been suppressed. And the "people" are not everyone, but the Revolutionaries themselves. "Peace to his people," therefore

does not mean peace of soul to those who have received the graces of Christ, nor peace to all men of good will, whether they be members of the Church or not, but "Victory for the Revolution," or "All power to the people," or "Long live the Revolution," or the like.

I refrain here from attempting discussion of the "Liturgy of the Word" of the "*Novus Ordo*." *It is a subject in itself*. But you can easily see how, with the new mode of reading parts of the Bible over a period of years, rather than a few chosen excerpts *every* year (as was done formerly), the faithful will lose all familiarity with Holy Writ. They will be helpless against a progressive debauchery of the sacred Scriptures. This is not idle speculation and needs no belabored proof. The meaning of the Scriptures has been for years undergoing a radical distortion that grows more extreme from month to month. Most people have almost no awareness at all of this calculated corruption. We shall have occasion to present a choice example of how this has been done when we come to speak of the Form of Consecration.

C. The Changing of the Canon

> Since it is proper that holy things be administered in a holy way, and since the Sacrifice (of the Mass) is the holiest of all things, the Catholic Church, in order that it be worthily and reverently offered and (clearly) recognized, has, over the course of many years instituted the Canon, so free of every error (Canon 6) that it contains nothing which is not redolent of greatest holiness and piety and which does not lift the minds of its offerers to God. For it is made up both of the words of the Lord Himself, and of the traditions of the Apostles, as well as the pious institution of saintly pontiffs.

> Canon 6: If anyone says that the Canon of the Mass contains errors and therefore should be abrogated, let him be anathema.[39]

"Eucharistic Prayers, Form Number One" is still given the self-contradictory and false subtitle "The Roman Canon." Being assured of our inertia and intellectual sleepiness, our manipulators enjoy treating us as utter dolts. The word "canon" means a *rule*, a *ruler*, a *standard or measure*, etc. It refers, therefore, to something fixed, unchangeable, and irreplaceable. The Canon of the Mass is, as it were, a criterion by which both the validity, the liceity, and indeed the excellence of the Consecration of the Mass are accomplished and adjudged. In the "*Novus Ordo*", "Eucharistic Prayer, Form Number One" is *not* the "Roman Canon" because it has been changed, or rather, mutilated, both in the Latin and in the translation. It is therefore a *crooked rule*. But calling it a "canon" is equivalent to saying: This is *the* Eucharistic Prayer of the Mass; all other forms are ineffective, fraudulent, useless, unacceptable, forbidden—including the three which follow, namely, "Eucharistic Prayers, Forms Number Two, Three, and Four."

As already mentioned, no matter how loosely Pope St. Pius V's *caveat* concerning tampering with the *Missale Romanum* might be interpreted, absolutely no case on the part of anyone can be found for laying hands on the Canon of the Mass. As P.H. Omlor has observed:

> On December 8, 1962 through the influences of the then nascent Robber Church, the Canon of the Mass, the ancient Roman Canon, was officially destroyed. With the insertion of the name of St. Joseph into it, a

[39] *Enchiridion Symbolorum*. Cc. Trid. Sess XXII, Cap. 4, p. 409, No. 942.

> change which went into effect on that day, the "Canon" of The Mass ceased to be a canon.[40]

He quotes E. E. Escourt as saying:

> The care taken to preserve the Canon in its original authentic form we learn from other writers. "In ancient times," says Muratori, "although the liturgy in the Roman Mass was observed generally in the churches of Italy, France, Germany, Britain, and other countries, yet there was no small variety in their Missals; but this did not affect the substance of the mystery, or the chief and essential rites of the Mass. The difference ran in adding collects, sequences, and special feasts, which each bishop might insert in his own missal. But to change the sacred words of the Canon was a crime." By the laws of Charlemagne it was ordered that only men of full age should be employed to transcribe it; and the Councils of York and Oxford (twelfth century) decreed that the Archbishop should examine in every church whether there were errors or defects in the Canon, either by the faults of transcribers or the books being old. Always too, the Canon was written in different and larger characters than the rest, and sometimes in gold letters throughout, as an offering of reverence.[41]

It was Pope John XXIII's unhappy distinction to be the first pope to permit a variation in the Canon of the Roman Mass in over thirteen hundred years.[42] This was a blameworthy blunder and a violation of a most sacrosanct tradition. Pope Paul VI first introduced three so-called "Eucharistic Prayers" alongside

[40] "The Robber Church" (Part 2) P. H. Omlor, *Interdum*. Issue No. 7, May 31, 1971. p. 3
[41] Ibid. p. 4
[42] Ibid. p. 3

the Canon (which might be used as alternatives to it), and then ALTERED the Form of the Consecration of wine. *This Act must be regarded as a transgression of maximum proportions. Independent of all other essentially related acts; it was a grievous and damnable sin and sacrilege!*

So momentous a thing was it for the Canon to be changed, that we must know why it was done. The reasons given, such as the need for variety, the advantage of accentuating various aspects of the sacred mystery of the Eucharist, etc., were pure verbiage. Why, for instance, should a priest need variety in the offering of the most sacred prayer of which a human being is capable? What he needs, obviously, is sanctity, and a deep insight into the meaning of this ineffable Rite. And if there is to be a number of these "Eucharistic Prayers," why should there be only four; why not five, or ten, or a hundred? It has been observed that many priests recite only one of the four all the time. Others, taking their cue from the "*Novus Ordo*", no doubt, make up their own. If there is any good in mere variety, leaving each priest to fashion his own liturgy is the surest way to get it. No, there is a surer way yet, for other priests have hit upon it—letting members of their "audience" formulate the prayers, extemporaneously. This is really keen.

So completely contrary to law, as well as to every tradition and liturgical principle, is the tampering with the sacred Canon, that we are bound to be altogether suspicious of the changes which were introduced. The presumption must be that they were inspired by malice, deceit, and faithlessness. Pope St. Pius V would surely say the same thing. Since there is absolutely no good reason for the change, since nothing good has (or can) come from it, and since its perpetrators have persistently ignored all questions and objections and criticism, the very worst intentions on their part must be presumed.

The worst possible intention discernible for what has been done to the Canon is the desire to destroy the Mass itself. And, surely enough, the more carefully one studies what has been done, the clearer it becomes that this was the exact intention.

It goes without saying that, such being the case, defect of intention in the rite itself can hardly be denied.[43] *Those priests who have no other INTENTION than that expressed by the "Novus Ordo" certainly do not effect the transubstantiation of the bread and the wine!* It should be remembered that the Church presumes invalidity wherever *serious* irregularities are present. The "*Novus Ordo*" is an irregularity of colossal proportions from beginning to end. Let me remind you, the matter at issue here is not some mundane ephemerality, but the infinitely Holy Mass and Blessed Eucharist. The power of Transubstantiation is, after all, the power of Christ. It is not to be imagined that He exercises it unless all requisites are present.

There can be no denying that the creators of the "New Mass" took the greatest pains to alter as much as possible the entire ritual of the Mass, without being too obvious about it —though one wonders how much more obvious they could have been. It is hard to believe that anyone who studies the "New Mass" with eyes clear could come to any other conclusion than that beneath all the pretended fervor for renewal was a spirit of diabolical hatred for everything Catholic, and particularly for the Holy Mass, the most

[43] The requisites for the valid celebration of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass are four: *a) minister*; the celebrant must be a validly ordained priest; *b) intention*: the celebrant must have the intention of doing what the Church does; *c) matter*: the elements of the Mass must be wheaten bread and grape wine, made without additives; *d) form*: the proper form (words) of Consecration must be used. These requisites must be considered to make up the substance of the sacrament of the Eucharist. According to the Council of Trent, these requirements cannot be altered by anyone, not even the Church itself, since they were established by Christ (Cf. *Enchiridion Symbolorum*. Cc. Trid: Sess. XXI. Cap. 2, No. 1728, p. 405).

Catholic of all things. Such hatred could hardly be free from the fiercest compulsion to bring both our religion and the Mass to total ridicule, degradation, and ruination.

The vicious determination of the plotters to nullify the sacrificial intention of the True Mass and the reality of Transubstantiation is painfully obvious. That the "New Mass" is acceptable to those who certainly do not believe in these essential mysteries should be proof enough. The reason that such notions as these seem extreme to most people is that they have never bestirred themselves concerning the matter. If Catholicism had ever been dependent for its survival on such lethargic souls as theirs, it would never have endured the first attempt at its subversion, nor its first persecution; nor would the Church in the future emerge from its present stupor, as surely it will.

D. The new form of Consecration

We shall not attempt here a thorough analysis of the Eucharistic Prayers. Rather, we shall concentrate on that part of the four prayers which is common to all, but which has been made different from the True Canon, the prayer which begins "*Qui pridie*," with the Consecration Forms which follow. We will base our investigation mainly on *(1)* the Epiclesis itself, together with the three phrases: *(2)* "*mysterium fidei*," *(3)* "*Haec quotiescumque*," *(4)* "*pro multis*." Below, we will give these phrases in their proper context. Let me summarize the whole argument before presenting it in detail.

The main purpose of the changes made in the Canon was to transform the sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ present on the altar into a mere memorial supper, which recalls Our Lord's last meal with His disciples before His death. This was

done by the simple expedient of fusing the Consecratory formulae into the preparatory prayer, *Qui Pridie*. This was the unadmitted reason behind the removal of the words "*mysterium fidei*" from the Consecration Form of the wine. The replacement of the sentence which begins "*Haec quotiescumque*" was part of the same tactic.

The reason for mistranslating the words "*pro multis*" to mean "for all men" was to implant the Lutheran error (held by almost all Protestants) that through the Sacrifice of Christ on the Cross, all will be saved who have faith in that Sacrifice, regardless of their own moral goodness, regardless of their acceptance of other revealed truths, regardless of membership in the Church. But this idea is only an intermediary one, meant to suggest a still more heterodox idea, that eventually *all men* will be saved—taken to Heaven—even the damned.

Here I give first, on the left, the Latin of the prayer, *Qui Pridie*, as found in the *Missale Romanum.* (In liturgical parlance it is called an *epiclesis*; it can also be spelled, *epiklesis*.) Next to it is the correct English translation of the prayer. Then comes the altered Latin version given in the "*Novus Ordo*", which most people think is the same thing as that found in *Missale Romanum*. Last, appears the faulty (what else?) English rendering of the "*Novus Ordo's*" altered version.[44]

The numbers in parenthesis indicate what phrases will be under discussion; notice the order in which they will be taken. The choice of these phrases is dictated by the need we have of understanding clearly the true nature of the Consecration, the very center of the Mass. We must have this understanding if we are to perceive how, with a few cunning strokes, the

[44] Every word and letter and capitalization and punctuation mark has been copied exactly from the official texts of the *Missale Romanum*, the *St. Andrew's Daily Missal*, the *Novus Ordo Missae*, and the *ICEL General Instruction and New Order of the Mass*, Copyright 1969 by International Committee on English in the Liturgy, Inc.

manipulators have been able to set at naught the sacramental import of the words and to disrupt the careful balance of ideas, guarded so jealously by all former Catholic generations, but relinquished so unconcernedly by this present one.

Epiclesis and Consecration Form from the Roman Canon	*Correct Translation*
Qui, pridie quam pateretur, accepit panem in sanctas ac venerabiles manus suas, et elevates oculis in caelum ad te Deum Patrem suum omnipotentem, tibi gratias agens, benedixit, fregit, deditque discipulis suis, dicens: Accipite, et manducate ex hoc omnes.	Who the day before He suffered took bread into His holy and venerable hands, and with His eyes lifted up to heaven, unto Thee, God, His almighty Father, giving thanks to Thee, He blessed, broke and gave it to His disciples, saying: Take and eat ye all of this,
HOC EST ENIM CORPUS MEUM.	FOR THIS IS MY BODY.
Simili modo postquam cenatum est, accipiens et hunc praeclarum Calicem in sanctas ac venerabiles manus suas, item tibi gratias agens, benedixit, deditque discipulis suis, dicens: Accipite, et bibite ex eo omnes.	In like manner, after He had supped, taking also this excellent chalice into His holy and venerable hands, and giving thanks to Thee, He blessed and gave it to His disciples, saying: Take and drink ye all of this,
HIC EST ENIM CALIX SANGUINIS MEI, NOVI ET AETERNI TESTAMENTI: MYSTERIUM FIDEI: [1] QUI PRO VOBIS ET PRO MULTIS [3] EFFUNDETUR IN REMISSIONEM PECCATORUM.	FOR THIS IS THE CHALICE OF MY BLOOD, OF THE NEW AND ETERNAL TESTAMENT: THE MYSTERY OF FAITH: [1] WHICH SHALL BE SHED FOR YOU AND FOR MANY [3] UNTO THE REMISSION OF SINS.
Haec quotiescumque feceritis, in mei memoriam facietis. [2]	As often as ye shall do these things, ye shall do them in

remembrance of Me. [2]

Narratio Institutionis of the Novus Ordo Missae ("Narrative of the Institution")[45]

Qui, pridie quam pateretur, accepit panem in sanctas ac venerabiles manus suas, et elevates oculis in caelum ad te Deum Patrem suum omnipotentem, tibi gratias agens benedixit, fregit, deditque discipulis suis, dicens:

ACCIPITE ET MANDUCATE
EX HOC OMNES:
HOC EST ENIM CORPUS MEUM,
QUOD PRO VOBIS TRADETUR.

Simili modo, postquam cenatum est, accipiens et hunc praeclarum calicem in sanctas ac venerabiles manus suas, item tibi gratias agens benedixit, dededitque discipulis suis, dicens:

ACCIPITE ET BIBITE EX EO
OMNES: HIC EST ENIM CALIX
SANGUINIS MEI NOVI ET AETERNI
TESTAMENTI, QUI PRO VOBIS ET
PRO MULTIS [3] EFFUNDETUR IN
REMISSIONEM PECCATORUM.
HOC FACITE IN MEAM
COMMEMORATIONEM. [2]

Faulty Translation

[1] The day before he suffered he took bread in his sacred hands and looking up to heaven, to you, his almighty Father, he gave you thanks and praise. [2] He broke the bread, gave it to his disciples, and said: Take this, all of you, and eat it: this is my body which will be given up for you.

When supper was ended, he took the cup. [4] Again he gave you thanks and praise, gave the cup to his disciples, and said: Take this, all of you, and drink from it: this is the cup of my blood, the blood of the new and everlasting covenant. [5] it will be shed for you and for all men [3] so that sins may be forgiven. [6] do this in memory of me. [2][46]

[45] *Ordo Missae—Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis*. Vatican Press. Rome. 1969 pp.113–114.
[46] *The General Instruction and The New Order of the Mass*, International Committee on English in the Liturgy, Inc. Published by the Priests of the Sacred Heart, Hales Corners, Wisconsin. Copyrighted 1969 by ICEL.

1. The Epiclesis and Form of Consecration

In order to concentrate on the words in question, I am taking no notice of the many gestures of too-poor reverence, the purposeful silence, the ineffable intimacy, the awe-inspiring deliberateness, that the *Missale Romanum* requires of the tremulous celebrant, all of which are regarded as archaic, anti-social, and in bad taste by the "desacralizers."

Before all else, it must be understood that the *Qui Pridie* and the Form of Consecration in the True Mass are, neither singly nor taken together, *a mere narration of the event of the Last Supper.* The *Qui Pridie* is the setting and the preparation for *pronouncement* of the Consecration formula, as well as the prayer wherein the celebrant bears witness to the essential unity of the institution of the sacrament with the Sacrifice of the Cross. Fr. Joseph Jungmann points out that all liturgies do the same:

> It is in the very nature of the Christian liturgy of the Mass that the account of the institution of the Blessed Sacrament should not be recited as a merely historical record, as are other portions of the Gospels. Indeed, the words of the account are spoken over the bread and a chalice, and, in accord with Our Lord's word, are uttered precisely in order to repeat Christ's action. This repetition is, in fact, accomplished in all its essentials by rehearsing the words of the account of the institution.[47]

In the *Qui Pridie*, the Last Supper is mentioned to remind us of the priest's intention of repeating that act by which Christ transubstantiated the bread and wine, giving His Apostles His Body and Blood. When He accomplished this marvelous miracle, the Sacrifice of Calvary was made

[47] *The Mass Of the Roman Rite—Its Origins and Development*. Rev. Joseph A Jungmann, S.J. Benziger Brothers, Inc. New York, 1955 Vol. 2. p. 201

sacramentally present there in the Upper Room. When the priest at Mass accomplishes the same ineffable wonder, the Body and Blood of Christ become present on the altar. If no transubstantiation takes place during the Mass, it would be nothing more than a sentimental memorial of the Last Supper, and imply that the Last Supper itself was nothing more than a dramatic and sorrowful going-away banquet which Christ ate with the Twelve.

The Form of Consecration is not considered to be a prayer of the priest. Rather, it is the evocation of a direct and most glorious act from God Himself. Through his pronunciation of the Consecration Form, the priest's humanity and individuality become identified with the infinite power and redemptive intention of Christ on the Cross. At this point, the priest speaks as if he were Christ Himself, and Christ acts through the priest's will and words, both as the consecrator and the oblation, the eternal High-Priest and the saving victim, the supreme mediator and the mutual gift.

In the Epiclesis of the True Mass (again, I remind you, this is the prayer which begins, *Qui Pridie*), the obvious emphasis is on the fact that the priest intends to do what Christ did at the Last Supper, namely, consecrate the offerings, change them into the Body and Blood of the Savior. In the "Epiclesis" of the "New Mass," the emphasis has been obviously and unmistakably shifted, even though the words used are generally the same. Here there is nothing left to indicate that the "president" is actually *consecrating*, or intends to. Traditional-minded Catholics *presume* he is doing so; perhaps he also *presumes* he is doing so—although, again, perhaps he does not; you cannot be certain. While everyone is doing all this presuming, what is really happening is that *the "president" is merely telling what happened at the Last Supper*. Nor is he telling of the transubstantiation of the bread and wine into the Body

and Blood of Our Lord; he is telling of the eating and drinking of bread and wine.

Let us look closely at the English of the "New Mass": The Latin text of the "*Narratio*" (in the "New Mass") has three sentences; its faulty translation has six. (Keep in mind that during a vernacular "mass," it makes no difference what the Latin has!) The simple device of dividing the text into shorter sentences not only reduces it to nothing more than a narrative, but also, changes the meaning of the words, as we shall see. The first sentence contains a reference to the suffering of Christ (the Latin words "*gratias agens*," let me mention in passing, do not mean "he gave…thanks and praise," but, "giving thanks"). Then the second sentence is entirely new: "He broke the bread, gave it to his disciples, and said: Take this, all of you, and eat it: this is my body which will be given up for you." Perhaps you do not see the ambiguity. In the True Mass, the priest says, "Take and eat ye all of this, FOR THIS IS MY BODY." The omission of the word, "*for*" (in Latin, "*enim*") and the stopping of the sentence with the colon, make the words *this* and *it* of the faulty translation refer to their antecedent, *bread*. This ambiguity does not exist in the Latin of the "*Novus Ordo*" because "*hoc*" is both neuter and singular and can refer only to the neuter, singular noun, "*Corpus*" ("*Body*").

The identical distortion is committed in the fourth sentence with reference to the wine. This sentence reads: "Again he gave you thanks and praise, gave the cup to his disciples, and said: Take this, all of you, and drink from it: this is the cup of my blood, the blood of the new and everlasting covenant." Here again the Latin word "*enim*" ("*for*") is not translated; a colon is put in its place. The result is that the clauses of the sentence are separated completely. The words *this* and *it* refer to the wine, not to the "*cup of my blood.*"

Now consider how the "*Narratio*" in the "*Novus Ordo*" is printed (We are referring to the Latin text.) The words "ACCIPITE ET MANDUCATE EX HOC OMNES" ("Take this, all of you, and eat it") are given the same bold capitalization as the words of consecration, "HOC EST ENIM CORPUS MEUM" ("this is my body…"). It is the same with the words "ACCIPITE ET BIBITE EX EO OMNES:" ("Take this, all of you, and drink from it:"), as also with the words which in liturgical terms are called the Anamnesis: "HOC FACITE IN MEAM COMMEMORATIONEM" ("Do this is memory of me."). The reason for the bold and enlarged capitals in the *Missale Romanum* of St. Pius V is the need to separate them from the Epiclesis and the Anamnesis, and to indicate that they are the Form of Consecration. This very purpose is undeniably negated in the "Novus Ordo;" instead, and this is most important, the capitalization of the words which speak of taking and eating, taking and drinking have the double effect of fusing the words of consecration into the "Narratio," or Narration, and, at the same time, of heightening the importance of the idea of eating and drinking—not, mind you—the Body and Blood of Christ, but of the bread and wine, which the demonstratives and pronouns logically and grammatically refer to. As we shall see when we discuss the apparently innocuous change of the words of the Anamnesis, "*Haec quotiescumque feceritis, in mei memoriam facietis*" ("As often as ye shall do these things, ye shall do them in remembrance of Me") to "*Hoc facite in meam commemorationem*" ("Do this in memory of me"), the effect is the very same. And that effect is the complete eradication of the Form of Consecration.

This typography is truly radical. Nor can it be the result of the printer's caprice or oversight; it corresponds exactly with the "wishes" of Pope Paul VI himself, as he expressed them in

his "decree" *Missale Romanum*. Allow me to quote them in their context:

> However, for pastoral reasons, and in order to facilitate concelebration, we have ordered that the words of the Lord ought to be identical in each formulary of the Canon. Thus, in each Eucharistic Prayer, we wish that the words be pronounced thus: over the bread: "*Accipite et manducate ex hoc omnes: Hoc est enim Corpus meum, quod pro vobis tradetur; over the chalice: Accipite et bibite ex eo omnes: Hic est enim calix Sanguinis mei novi et aeterni testamenti, qui pro vobis et pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum. Hoc facite in meam commemorationem*."[48] [The Pope's italics]

The reader will observe that the Pope is careful not to refer to the words quoted above as the "Form of Consecration." Instead, they are described as "the words of the Lord," which must mean the words of the Lord as they are quoted in the "Narratio", the account of the Lord's Supper. Neither here nor anywhere else in his Apostolic Constitution does the Pontiff refer to the mystery of Transubstantiation. From beginning to end, his main emphasis is on the "readings" of the new "missal," with which the people will "nourish themselves day by day."

Pope Paul says: "We have ordered that the words of the Lord ought to be, etc." How is it that the Pope may order what the "words of the Lord ought to be?"

Few seem to have noticed the two main reasons the Pope gives for so radical an alteration in the very center of the "mass," but they are there, big as life, "for pastoral reasons, and in order to facilitate concelebration." How many people know to this day what these "pastoral reasons" are, and how the

[48] Appendix II, par 6

complete emasculation of the Form of Consecration serves to "facilitate concelebration?" Perhaps it will help if they recall that the word "pastoral" in the code language of the Revolution means, "for the people," that is, "for the sake of the Renewal" or the "Revolution itself." Again, the abandonment of the Form of Consecration and its reduction to a mere narrative can only be understood by realizing that, in many "concelebrated masses" many of the "concelebrants," both "Catholic" and Protestant, certainly do not believe in the power of Transubstantiation. Thanks to this "slight" adjustment, they may use any of the four "Eucharistic Prayers" without the risk of such a marvel occurring.

2. *"Mysterium Fidei"*

Have you wondered why this phrase was taken from the hitherto inviolable Consecration Form of the wine? In his Apostolic Constitution, *Missale Romanum*, Pope Paul says, "The words *mysterium fidei*, taken from the context of the words of Christ the Lord, and said by the priest, serve as an introduction to the acclamation of the faithful" (Appendix II, Par. 6). This is saying *what* had happened to these words, not *why*!

If you ask the "playwrights," they will tell you this phrase in the True Mass is an interruption in the *narrative* of the consecration of the wine by our Divine Savior. It is a break in the thought, they will say; it is not scriptural. All of a sudden, you see, they feign great scholarliness. After making a veritable shambles of the entire liturgy of the Roman Rite through the most egregious mistranslations, silly interpolations, and needless omissions and dislocations, they have the temerity to claim that their itchy-fingered meddling is inspired by devotion to the sacred Scriptures. Their fancied biblicism betrays them here, however, since as Father Jungmann points

out, liturgical usage *pre-dates* the Scriptures, and even explains the divergencies among the various accounts of the institution of the Blessed Sacrament.

> In all the known liturgies the core of the *eucharistia*, and therefore of the Mass, is formed by the narrative of institution and the words of consecration. Our very first observation in this regard is the remarkable fact that the texts of the account of institution, among them in particular the most ancient (whether as handed down or as reconstructed by comparative studies), are never simply a Scripture text restated. They go back to pre-biblical tradition. Here we face an outgrowth of the fact that the Eucharist was celebrated long before the evangelists and St. Paul set out to record the Gospel story. Even the glaring discrepancies in the biblical texts themselves regarding this very point are explained by this fact. For in them we evidently find segments from the liturgical life of the first generation of Christians.[49]

Though there was, during the years gone by, no little discussion about both the exact meaning of the words "*mysterium fidei*" in the context of the Consecration formula, and the date of their introduction into it, that they are an essential part of the Form of Consecration is not in any way open to question. Consider the following Monitum from the Holy Office in 1958:

> This Supreme Sacred Congregation has learned that in a certain translation of the New Order of Holy Week into the vernacular, the words "*mysterium fidei*" in the form of the consecration of the chalice are omitted. It is

[49] *The Mass of the Roman Rite*. Jungmann. Vol 2. pp. 194–195.

> also reported that some priests omit these words in the very celebration of Mass.
>
> Therefore this Supreme Congregation gives warning that it is impious (*nefas*) to introduce a change in so sacred a matter and to mutilate or alter editions of liturgical books (cf. Can. 1399, 10).
>
> Bishops therefore, in accordance with the warning of the Holy Office of 14 February, 1958, should see to it that the prescriptions of the sacred canons on divine worship be strictly observed, and they should be closely watchful that no one dare to introduce even the slightest change in the matter and form of the sacraments.[50]

Clearly, the removal of this phrase is a very serious violation of the law of the Church—this, aside from the question of whether its removal in the present instance may contribute to rendering the "New Mass" invalid. Regardless, in this writing we are more concerned with the morality of the "New Mass," which, as we have said before, is a more basic issue. Now the reader should keep in mind that fulfilling the law of the Church is a moral obligation so that a *serious* violation of the law is mortally sinful and renders the Mass sacrilegious. This sinfulness derives from the illegality, and the illegality derives from the intrinsic wrongfulness of the act itself (a violation of the sacrament of the Eucharist), the Church having made the law to point out the sin. To violate the law, therefore, is to violate the sacrament.

> If anyone adds or takes away anything [from the form of Consecration of the Body and the Blood,] even

[50] "Omission of the Words '*Mysterium Fidei*' in the Consecration of the Chalice." A Monitum of the Holy Office dated July 24, 1958, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*. Vol. 50, p. 536.

> if he does not change the meaning of the form, he does confect [the sacrament], *but he sins grievously.*[51]

Is this not edifying then? The highest authorities of the Church are found appealing to the divine Scriptures, while committing a desecration against the form of the most Holy Sacrament, and attempting to oblige priests to participate in the sin—and in most cases, succeeding. This is another choice example of the phariseism of the "reform."

The *Critique* of the Roman Theologians on the "*Novus Ordo*" considers that there may well be a case of invalidity here. The removal of the words "*mysterium fidei*" may not have been as harmless as it appeared. And the argument hinges upon the fact that the forms of Consecration have been made part of the Last Supper narrative. To quote the *Critique*:

> The narrative mode is now underlined by the formula: "*Narratio institutionis"* (No. 55d), and backed up by the definition of the commeration, where it is said that "*Ecclesia memoriam ipsius Christi agit"* (No. 55c). (The Church acts in memory of Christ Himself.)
>
> "In short, the theory proposed for the epiclesis (i.e., the prayer, *Qui Pridie),* the modification of the words of the Consecration and of the commemoration have the effect of changing the true import of the words of Consecration. The consecration formulae are now pronounced by the priest as part of a historic narration, and no longer expresses a categorical affirmation on the part of Him in Whose Person the priest acts: "*Hoc est Corpus meum"* ["This is my Body"] (and not: "*Hoc est Corpus Christi"* ["This is the Body of Christ"]).[52]

[51] *Missale Romanum*. Desclee. De Defectibus, Ch. V.

[52] Critique. p. 13.

In reference to these words, footnote number 15 of the *Critique* says:

> The words of the Consecration, as they appear in the context of the "*Novus Ordo*", may be valid according to the intention of the ministering priest. But they may not be, for they are so no longer *ex vi verborum* (by the force of the words used) or more precisely, in virtue of the *modus significandi* (way of signifying) which they have had till now in the Mass. Will priests who, in the near future, have not had the traditional training and who rely on the "*Novus Ordo*" in order to "do what the Church does" make a valid consecration? One may be permitted to doubt it.[53]

The *Critique* has been proved correct beyond all doubt. There are hundreds of priests who certainly do not validly consecrate, due to their complete incapacity of forming the correct intention; and their number increases daily. Steeped as many are in the rationalistic faithlessness of Revolutionism, they have only the most distorted, confused, and even cynical view of traditional Catholic doctrine. Faith in the dogma of the Eucharist and even in the divinity of Christ is quite beyond many of them.

Nor should that other body of erstwhile celebrants be forgotten. I refer to those whose dull-witted indifference to such supernal matters as the absolute necessity of proper forms and intentions for the confection of the sacraments (such as is manifested by their robot-like readiness to do anything, say anything, or preach anything which bears the signature of their hierarchical custodians), bespeaks a very questionable faith; or rather, suggests that they have so

[53]Ibid.

completely surrendered their minds and wills to their Masonic masters, that they are quite incapable of having any intention different from, or contrary to, what is programmed into them.

In the "*Novus Ordo,*" the intention of re-enacting the Sacrifice of the Cross in an unbloody manner is not in clear evidence. It is *deliberately* not in evidence because it needs to be acceptable to the innumerable priests who do not share Holy Mother Church's intentions with respect to the Mass, who do not believe in their own power of Transubstantiation, nor in the need for such a power. Also, the "New Mass" had to be made acceptable to Protestant ministers, which of course it is. Many of them participate in it with joyful gusto, under the impression that finally the Roman Catholic Church has been converted to true Christianity, or at least is showing remarkable promise.

3. *"Haec quotiescumque"*

It is in connection with the removal of the words "*mysterium fidei*" that we must inquire why the words of Christ's instruction, "As often as you shall do these things, you shall do them in memory of Me," have been changed. Notice the difference in the two Latin words which begin each of the sentences under study:

Missale Romanum: *"Haec quotiescumque feceritis"* ("as often as you shall do these things")

Novus Ordo Missae: *"Hoc facite"* ("Do this")

The "*haec*" is plural and means "these things," whereas "*hoc*" is singular and means "this." "These things" refers to all the things which Christ Our Lord and the Apostles, his new

priests, are doing, that is, His taking bread, giving thanks, etc., and their eating of what He calls His Body; and His taking the chalice, and the rest, and their drinking of His Precious Blood. Christ is telling them to do all "*these things*", to use these elements, to use these words, to eat and drink, all in memory of His eminent self-oblation for the remission of the sins of "the many."

The singular demonstrative, "*hoc*" ("*this*"), in the "New Mass" formula cannot be taken necessarily to mean the same thing. It could easily (and more logically) refer only to what the Apostles themselves were doing, namely, eating and drinking: "Take and eat…," "Take and drink…," "Do *this*…" You see how the idea of a mere commemorative meal could be inferred (and indeed is being inferred by young people). In the context of all the other anti-sacrificial and anti-sacramental maneuvers one finds in the "New Mass," it is impossible not to infer exactly this meaning.

The point gains force when we remind ourselves that there can be absolutely no excuse for any ambiguity or vagueness about this matter. For if there were any such possibility, all the "reformers" would have had to do was leave things as they were! The very fact that they did not is incriminating in itself. I might add that, by the change, they were violating a tradition which goes back to the earliest period of the Roman liturgy. As Father Jungmann says:

> The sacred account concluded with the command to repeat what Christ had done. The text is taken basically from St. Paul; however, the entire Roman tradition, from Hippolytus on, has substituted for the Pauline phrase "whenever you drink it," the phrase "whenever you do this."[54]

[54] Jungmann. Op. Cit. Vol.2, p. 201.

In other words, the ambiguous alteration in the "*Novus Ordo*" fits the "reformers" purpose of conveying a further misconception. Immediately after the *"Hoc facite"* appears what is called an "acclamation." The priest says to the people, "Let us proclaim the mystery of faith," and they respond, "Christ has died, Christ is risen, Christ will come again." The words were chosen in reminiscence of the passage in St. Paul:

> *This do ye, as often as you shall drink, for the commemoration of me,*
>
> *For as often as you shall eat this bread, and drink the chalice, you shall shew the death of the Lord,* ***until he come.*** [Author's emphasis]
>
> 1 Corinthians 11:25–26

Commenting on this choice, the aforementioned *Critique* says:

> Then the acclamation assigned to the people immediately after the Consecration ("*mortem tuam annuntiamus Domine, etc., donec venias"*) ["We announce Thy death, O Lord, etc. until thou shouldst come."] brings us to the crowning ambiguity with regard to the Real Presence, under pretext of concern about the Last Day. Without a break the expectation of Christ's second coming at the end of time is proclaimed at precisely the moment when He is *actually* present on the altar—as if the second coming, and not this, were the true coming.[55]

I might add, this is but another instance of the reformers' yen for using the Scriptures as a cover for their manipulations.

[55] *Critique*. p. 13.

4. *"PRO MULTIS"*

> It will be shed for you and *for all men* so that sins may be forgiven.

It is necessary here to turn our attention to the English translation of the "*Novus Ordo*." Our discussion centers around the phrase "for all men." The Latin of the "*Novus Ordo*" corresponds with that of the *Missale Romanum*, as you can see in the comparative renderings given above: both have "*pro multis*," which even the slowest Latin student understands to mean *"for many" (i.e., "for many" men, people, persons,* or the equivalent). If one wishes to say "for all men" in Latin, he must say "pro omnibus."

The question we are here discussing will remain for all time to come one of the most culpable, and at the same time incredible, delinquencies in the history of the Church. Incredible, because it cannot be brought to give it a moment's consideration, even though it is impossible for anyone honestly to deny the error or who they are that are guilty of it, or who had the responsibility for preventing it, and who now have the responsibility for correcting it. It *is* so serious a question because *there is every reason to believe the erroneous rendering of these two Latin words invalidates the Consecration of the wine* when the vernacular "for all men" is used.

Attention was called to this error by P. H. Omlor in March of 1968, after the English "Canon" was introduced into the Revised Rite of the Mass on October 22, 1967.[56] Since that time, even though the possibility of invalidity has become known around the world (hundreds of priests having steadfastly *refused* to use the translations, and many Catholics

[56] *Questioning the Validity of the Masses Using the New, All-English Canon*, P. H. Omlor, Athanasius Press

having *discontinued attending "masses"* where it is recited), no one of sufficiently great authority has taken it seriously enough to dare call for an emendation. The Pope himself has remained deaf to all complaints concerning the matter. And no theologian worthy of the title has ventured either to defend, to explain away, or to refute the argument. I put it this way, because those few who have attempted to refute the invalidity thesis have done it in such a puerile fashion, that either they were not serious theologians, or they were not serious, period. Are we then forced to conclude that, at present, the Church has no theologians worthy of the title?

The colossal irony of the whole affair is that the "reformers," instead of correcting the gross and altogether conspicuous error by making a few uncomplicated corrections, left it as it first erroneously appeared, and thus succeeded in doing less effectively what they obviously have in mind to do, namely, heap as much abuse and sacrilege upon the Head of Christ as one generation might be capable of. Those in power in the Church have waged a persistent, albeit futile, campaign to prove that no error has been made, and that those who let themselves be bothered by such trifles are "sick in the head." The sycophantic gymnastics which have been attempted by some who imagine themselves defenders of Catholic Orthodoxy, in an effort to justify this intolerable falsity, have contributed greatly to its continuance. After viewing the shameful spectacle from its beginning, one can only conclude that the whole Catholic people is in the thrall of some psychedelic miasma whereby they are invulnerable to the imperatives of simple and objective truth, inviolable law, the Divine will, and basic honesty.

The argument against "for all men" is this: the rendering of *pro multis* as *for all men* is by no means a minor discrepancy. It is a most serious mutilation of the meaning of the words of

Consecration of the wine, at least (possibly of both the bread and the wine[57]). Hence, *if the pronouncements of the Church are to be taken literally*, apart from all the other faults which can be found with the "*Novus Ordo,"* despite the best intentions of the sincerest priests in the world, and in spite of the guileless fervor of the lay people in attendance, *no sacrifice of any kind is being offered* (unless it be to Baal, the god of the "New Religion"). "Then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain" (1 Cor. 15:14). The reason is, the Form of Consecration has been vitiated and nullified. In mistranslating these few words (again, to say nothing of other irregularities), these arrogant "improvers" have altered the Form essentially, so that the supposed all-important effect does not come about.

According to the *Missale Romanum*,

> Wherefore the words of Consecration, which are the form of this sacrament, are these: *Hoc est enim Corpus meum;* and *Hic est enim Calix Sanguinis mei, novi et aeterni testamenti: mysterium fidei: qui pro vobis et pro multis effundetur in Remissionem peccatorum* (For this is my Body; and: For this is the Chalice of my Blood, of the new and eternal testament: the mystery of faith: which shall be shed for you and for many unto the remission of sins.)…If anyone removes or changes anything in the Form of Consecration of the Body and Blood, and by this change of words does not signify the same thing as these words do, he does not confect the sacrament.[58]

[57] If the Consecration of the wine is invalid, is the Consecration of the bread invalid also? This is a perfectly legitimate question for theologians to discuss. The Church has made no final pronouncement on the matter. A number of factors would enter into the discussion. We do not intend to become involved in the argument here, since our main concern is with the morality and the liceity of the "New Mass". The law of the Church requires that no one allow himself to get into situations of doubt in such sacred matters as these. To do so deliberately, even once, is a serious sin.

[58] *Missale Romanum*. Desclee, *De Defectibus*. Ch. V, Par. 1.

And the next sentence says by doing this "he would sin grievously."

In explanation of the necessity of the words of this Form, the *Catechism of the Council of Trent* says:

> The additional words for you and for many, are taken, some from Matthew (26:28), some from Luke (22:20), but were joined together by the Catholic Church under the guidance of the Spirit of God. They serve to declare the fruit and advantage of His Passion. For if we look to its value, we must confess that the Redeemer shed His blood for the salvation of all; but if we look to the fruit which mankind have received from it, we shall easily find that it pertains not unto all, but to many of the human race. When therefore (Our Lord) said: 'For you,' He meant either those who were present, or those chosen from among the Jewish people, such as were, with the exception of Judas, the disciples with whom He was speaking. When He added, "*And for many*," He wished to be understood to mean the remainder of the elect from among the Jews or Gentiles.
>
> With reason, therefore, were the words *for all* not used, as in this place the fruits of the Passion are alone spoken of, and to the elect only did His Passion bring the fruit of salvation. And this is the purport of the Apostle when he says: "*Christ was offered once to exhaust the sins of many*" (Heb. 9:28); and also of the words of Our Lord in John: "*I pray for them, I pray not for the world, but for them whom thou hast given me, because they are Thine*" (John 17:9).[59]

The words, "*for you*" and "*for many*" are considered to be essential for the act of Consecration, because they are part of

[59] *Catechism of the Council of Trent*, John A. McHugh & Charles J. Callan. Joseph F. Wagner, Inc. New York, 1934. pp. 227–28.

what is called in sacramental theology, the *res sacramenti* of the Form, an untranslatable phrase, which refers to the purpose and end of the sacrament, that for which the particular graces of the sacrament will be granted. In the sacrament of the Eucharist, the *res sacramenti* is those words of the formula which indicate the redemption of them who will be saved through the Sacrifice of Christ and through union with His Mystical Body. As St. Alphonsus Liguori, a Doctor of the Church, explains:

> The words "*Pro vobis et pro multis"* ("For you and for many") are used to distinguish the virtue of the blood of Christ from its fruits: for the blood of our Savior is of sufficient value to save all men but its fruits are applicable only to a certain number and not to all, and this is their own fault. Or, as the theologians say, this precious blood is (in itself) sufficiently (*sufficienter*) able to save all men, but (on our part) effectually (*effcaciter*) it does not save all—it saves only those who co-operate with grace. This is the explanation of St. Thomas, as quoted by Benedict XIV.[60]

If you are new to this subject, you will surely be asking, "Well, then, how could they change the words as they did, if this is what the documents say?" Well, dear child, you are not supposed to ask questions like that, or have you not heard? Now, would you like me to tell you what explanation the local authorities will give to such a question? Well, fold your hands, sit very still, and listen:

It so happens that the translation of the English of the "mass" was produced by a crowd who called themselves the

[60] *Treatise on the Holy Eucharist*. St. Alphonsus Liguori. Quoted in *Questioning the Validity of the Masses Using the New, All-English Canon*. P. H. Omlor. Athanasius Press. Reno, Nevada. 1969. p. 60 Par. 123.

International Committee on English in the Liturgy (ICEL). Their justification for translating *pro multis* as "for all men" derives from the curious researches of a rationalist Scripture "scholar" whose name is Joachim Jeremias of the University of Göttingen (Germany). This man's recondite pontification has it that for lo, these two thousand years, the words of Our Lord at the Last Supper have been misrepresented! And who do you think did the misrepresenting? Why, St. Matthew and St. Mark, who else? Quoting Dr. Jeremias, ICEL explains:

> Neither Hebrew nor Aramaic possesses a word for 'all'. The word *rabbim* or 'multitude' thus served also in the inclusive sense for 'the whole', even though the corresponding Greek and Latin appear to have an exclusive sense, i.e., 'the many' rather than 'the all'.[61]

The doctor found this out all by himself—I mean, *altogether* by himself—for absolutely no one else knows about it not even the Hebrews, nor the Arameans, who could have sworn that they *did* have words to express the ideas represented in our language by the words "all" and "many!" (Our Lord spoke Aramaic. The word He would have used for *all* in this language is: *kol*, or *kolla*: the word He would have used for *many* is: *'saggi'an*.)

Even though St. Matthew and St. Mark both spoke Our Lord's vernacular tongue of Aramaic, they are both supposed to have made the identical error, neither one daring (or knowing enough) to correct the other. Apparently no one in the Apostolic Church caught the mistake. Nor did any of the early Church Fathers, none of the Doctors of the Church, none of

[61] *The Roman Canon in English Translation*. An ICEL booklet citing *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* by J. Jeremias (New York. 1966. pp. 179–182, 299) as quoted in "The Ventriloquists." P. H. Omlor. Athanasius Press, Reno, Nevada. 1970. p.7. (Reprinted from *Interdum*, Issue 2, February 24, 1970.)

the popes, not one of the great Schoolmen of the Middle Ages, no one in the whole wide world except one Joachim Jeremias. In fact, to this very day, he alone knows of this mistake, for his all-but-divine revelation has failed to impress scholars, both true and false. Witness, not a single translation of the Bible (the countless ones for which this deeply pious age has suddenly found a need) with all their unheard of, outrageous, and heterodox turns of phrases—not a single one of them, I say–indicates acceptance of this crack-pot theory that since Christ our God, the "Word made flesh," did not have a way, *could not devise a way*, to say "all," He had to be satisfied with saying "many" and waiting two thousand years for Dr. Jeremias to explain it for Him.

His explanation means, of course, that the word should be "all," not "many", in the following scriptural passages: "*All* are called, but few chosen" (Mt. 20–16). And, "The Son of man is not come to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a redemption for *all*" (Mt. 20:28). Speaking of the time of the Great Tribulation, Jesus meant to say, "for *all* (everybody!) will come in my name saying: I am Christ: and they will seduce *all* (everybody!)" (Mt. 24–5). *(Mein Himmel!)*

And are we not fortunate that those who have translated the Latin of the "*Novus Ordo*" were alert enough to recognize the brilliance of this momentous discovery, if no one else was?

But are you *still* wondering how "*pro multis*" came to be mistranslated? Yes, I thought you would be: The reference of ICEL to the opinion of Dr. Jeremias is all a mendacious ruse. The question at issue has nothing to do with Hebrew, Aramaic, or Greek. Further, all the arguments over Scriptural variations, philological findings, or even the decrees of the Council of Trent, are secondary to the main point, which is, that the *Latin* text of the Missal states that Christ Our Lord

said "for many". The most important fact is that the translation is false, deliberately, unmistakably, and scandalously. There is no excuse for it. And the whole Catholic world should demand that this mistranslation (along with all the other corruptions of the Mass) be corrected immediately. In their unabashed impudence, the liars have not bothered to get their story straight to this very day. Those vernacular garblements (as I said above, the same forgery is found in all the translations, not just the English one) first appeared in 1967. But the "*Novus Ordo*" was introduced in 1969, after loud attention had been called to the error, and its Latin still has "pro multis." These words remain even though other words in the sacramental form were altered, as we have seen.

This translation error is but another sacrilege of immeasurable proportion. You see that nothing is sacred to the "reformers." How those things which are most holy the meddlers must perforce make the most absurd and muddled! Satan rides high!

E. Validity and Liceity

For we know that the law is good, if a man use it lawfully.
1 Timothy 1–8

Despite all that has been said, however, the problem of the validity or invalidity of vernacular "English-Canon Masses"—or any of the new "masses," for that matter– cannot be decided by you or me. *Only the Church, in a saner day, will be able to make a definitive judgment*. It should be obvious that individuals are in no position to do so, and it does not help the cause for them to attempt to make that decision.

At the risk of seeming slow-witted, I must say that, from what I have been able to observe, the usual approaches to this

question seem to have been anachronistic, and overly belabored for that reason. By this I mean to say *they are at least five hundred years late*. All seem to have overlooked the preeminent fact that the Church has already made an official pronouncement on the matter; the Form of Consecration was expressly determined by the Council of Florence in the year 1442. Its pronouncement was as follows:

> Since the decree of the Armenians given above does not set forth the form of words which the most holy Roman Church has been always wont to use for the consecration of the Body and Blood of the Lord, it having been confirmed by the teaching and by the authority of the Apostles Peter and Paul, we judged it should be inserted herewith. In the consecration of the Body of the Lord this form of words is used: "*Hoc est enim corpus meum;"* and in that of the Blood: '*Hic est enim calix sanguinis mei, novi et aeterni testamenti, mysterium fidei, qui pro vobis et pro multis effundetur in Remissionem peccatorum.*' ('For this is My Body;' 'For this is the Chalice of my Blood, of the new and eternal testament: the mystery of faith: which shall be shed for you and for many unto the remission of sins.')[62]

It is on the basis of this decree that the *Missale Romanum* of Pope St. Pius V commands priests to adhere to this Form most strictly. In the chapter entitled "*De Defectibus*" ("Concerning Defects"), after having given the exact same words as the decree quoted above, the "*Missale*" continues:

> Wherefore the words of Consecration, which are the form of this sacrament, are these: etc: . .

[62] *Enchiridion Symbolorum*. Cc. *Florentinum: Decr. Pro Jacobitis*. P. 341, No. 1352.

> If anyone removes or changes anything in the Form of Consecration of the Body and Blood, and by this change of words does not signify the same thing as these words do, he does not confect the sacrament.[63]

According to this pronouncement, there is no valid consecration of the wine (and possibly of the bread) in these "masses," because clearly, such a change has been made by mistranslation in the English formula. The Pope, the bishops, the theologians, the priests, the people are either going to accept this pronouncement as a certain statement, or they are not. It becomes a question, therefore, of whether Catholics (of whatever station) are willing or concerned enough to accept the authority of the Church in this matter, one over which the Church alone has the authority to make a decision. Those who contradict this position must explain (to themselves first of all) how they can do so, and that, not by quoting the opinions of theologians—reputable, numerous, saintly or otherwise—but by explaining why the authoritative and definitive statement of the Church as of the year 1442 is no longer in effect, and what right they have to differ from it. If they do choose to differ from it, let them then hold their tongues concerning us who dare to differ with them about the right of Pope Paul VI to create a Fraud and call it "The Mass."

The bishops and other prelates of the Church feign great wonderment and even scandal to hear people say they have serious doubts about whether the wine is consecrated at these "masses." 'But you know,' they say, 'that there could be no error of this sort; you know that the Pope could not let such a thing happen! And you know that all the bishops could not make such an error. The translation was, after all, approved by the bishops in

[63] *Missale Romanum*. Desclee. *De Defectibus*. Ch. V. Par. 1.

plenary session!' (When you hear that phrase, "in plenary session," you are to find all your apprehensions whisked away as if they had been touched by the wand of the Fairy Godmother.) I, for one, do not know anything of the kind. But what I know does not prove anything anyhow. It is what the *documents* say that settles such questions, not the total silence of the Supreme Pontiff on the matter, and most certainly not the unanimous vote of certain groups of bishops. The *evidence* is that neither the words of Our Lord Jesus Christ Himself, nor the official teachings of the Church, which have stood for centuries, have any meaning whatsoever to these "priests of Baal." They seem to imagine that because they have the *votes* and because they have the control, they can therefore decide anything which suits their fancy, and those who say otherwise can be damned, for all they care. God will have His Sacrifice the way *they* prepare it for Him, or He will have none at all!

As mentioned above, discussion concerning the *validity* of the Consecration has seemed belabored. I was suggesting that many on that account may have allowed themselves to become too greatly entangled in this controversy. Many have thought that the problem would be solved if this single issue could be circumvented. And so they have agitated for "Latin Masses," meaning the "*Novus Ordo*" "said" in Latin. Thus have they shown their naiveté concerning the cause and purposes of the whole "renewal" hoax, in which the question of validity is really only a single—though, to be sure, not unimportant—aspect.

Another group has made a similar mistake: They are satisfied if, at the "*Novus Ordo,*" when it is "said" in the vernacular, the priest pronounces the words "for many" at the Consecration. Would that it were so simple!

These two groups are to be classified with yet another one: those who have made so much of this question of validity, that they have disregarded the more comprehensive and more basic consideration, that of the morality of the "New Mass." As I said in the beginning, this is because of their too legalistic approach to the entire question.

The root of this admittedly honest mistake is that these people have made nothing, or at least too little, of the incontrovertible fact that the "New Mass" is illicit. Its creation was sinful and sacrilegious for no other reason than that it was against the Law of the Church–*and therefore contrary to the will of God*. And its "celebration" is sinful for the very same reason. Consequently, it is also sinful to attend the "New Mass," to participate in it in any way, to receive Communion during it, to receive hosts which may or may not have been validly consecrated during it, or even to attend the True Mass where the "New Mass" customarily takes place (Cf. Canon 1172, Par. 1.3).

The spirit is among us which discounts the laws of the Church, as if they were less holy and less binding than the commandments of God. Such a spirit is Protestant, or worse, as if the Church did not rule in God's name and in His stead, as if she were not possessed of the authority to bind and to loose, to forgive and to retain, to open and to shut even the very gates of Heaven itself.

The so-called "Liberal Movement," which is but a part of the Revolution, is greatly responsible for this most serious and corruptive aberration in our thinking. We are all the witnesses of some of the ravages which this spirit has brought on the Church. The so-called "renewal" which was spawned at the Second Vatican Council is one of them. Were we to attempt to list them all, we would need to write a book instead of a paragraph. The abrogation of numberless laws, the relaxation

of all discipline, the granting of every kind of dispensation, regardless of whether it will prove beneficial or disastrous for souls, the failure to proclaim, legislate, or enforce Catholic moral principles are all the works of this decadence. The Church is afflicted with what might be described as the spirit of self-contempt, which never fails to show itself wherever the Revolution is able to sow its seeds. There seems to be a studied effort on the part of the Pope and many other ranking ecclesiastics (bishops included) to parade the lovely Bride of Christ in rags of shame for all the world to jeer and befoul. They call it charity and "ecumenism" to tolerate, nay, even to encourage every manner of attack upon her. Both her own disloyal children and her mean-mouthed, jealous enemies may hurl at her an insult, accusation, or blasphemy with never so much as word of defense being spoken in her behalf. Protestants, Jews, atheists, communists, infidels—anyone and everyone may ridicule her doctrine, calumniate her traditions, falsify her history, trample her honor, and scorn her saints. In return, they are all invited to sit at a table and carry on a "dialogue" with the hope of finding a solution to the annoyance the Church continues to be to them.

But this is not the limit of it. In the last few years, the Pope has proceeded to a more astounding form of treachery than has ever been known in the Church. This activity alone, in the Age of Faith, would easily have brought his deposition, if not have condemned him to the stake. This is his fraternization with the bestial ministers of communist governments, whose official policy, as an essential part of their world imperialism, is now, and always has been, to rid the Church from the face of the earth. These white-collared savages, whose hands drip with the blood of literally millions of Catholic and Christian martyrs, and whose every move and every word is admittedly inspired by a hatred of Christ, now receive the hospitality of the

Vatican. These ruthless war-mongers and usurpers of governments now come and go there, in order to negotiate what the Church will concede them in return for their not proceeding to stamp it out altogether. During these negotiations it would be exceedingly undiplomatic and provocative were it suggested that the Catholics in the prisons and concentration camps have done no crimes.

Such policies as these, and innumerable other forms of ignoble and dishonorable forbearance and abnegation, have served well to diminish and undermine the Church's authority and the love and respect due to it. Another book could be written on this subject. We will not begin it here. Suffice it to say that the intolerable Sacrilege which is the "New Mass" was and is possible only because there is prevalent, inside and out of the Church, the idea and spirit that the Church is a purely human institution, a kind of international moral association, whose laws are all revocable, dispensable, and purely human.

The very opposite is the case. The Church is our beloved Mother; it is the Mystical Body of Christ and the Kingdom of God on earth, endowed with all divine power and authority, the font of all grace, the repository of revealed truth, the spiritual sovereignty of the whole earth and of all created things, and the only source of salvation for men. It was by virtue of this unquestionable preeminence and authority that the Holy Mass of the Roman Rite was legislated as the liturgy for the Patriarchate of the West (the "Latin Rite"). And because of our obedience to this holy law we shall be granted its indescribably good and wholesome fruits. Such was the mind of Pope St. Pius V when he gave this Mass to us (or imposed it upon us—say it either way you wish; it was both a gift and a law); such is the truly Catholic view of this law, and our generation's tragic folly does not make the matter different.

To resume our principle discussion, when we speak of the establishment of the Mass of the *Missale Romanum*, we are making reference to its liceity, its legality. And when we speak of its liceity, we must necessarily mean that which is according to the divine will. As essential as is validity of consecration for the consummation of the Holy Sacrifice, of itself validity does not make the Mass *worthy*. You will recall the proverb, "The victims of the wicked are abominable to the Lord" (Proverbs 15:8). And again, the Psalmist says,

> *But to the sinner God hath said: Why dost thou declare my justices, and take my covenant in thy mouth?*
> *Seeing thou hast hated discipline: and hast cast my words behind thee.*
>
> Psalm 49:16–17

An act of transubstantiation alone is not sufficient, therefore. It is necessary that the Sacrifice be a worthy act of worship to God the Father. It should be obvious to anyone that a person cannot evaluate the "*Novus Ordo*" on the basis of validity only. Because of the acceptance of the "New Mass" as *legitimate,* the "Post-Conciliar Church" is too deaf and blind to consider seriously whether it is valid. Whereas, many so-called "conservative" Catholics, the "loyal opposition," would identify validity with legitimacy and therefore with worthiness. For our part, without knowing whether the "New Mass" is "valid," we say this, *it is undeniably illicit, and hence most abominable and displeasing in the eyes of God*. The children of the "New Religion" do not care what pleases God; the norm of their "liturgy" is what pleases themselves—"The people is Baal." Partaking somewhat of this very spirit, those who make too much of the validity question would be satisfied to know whether, "by hook or by crook," a sacrifice were being offered, and they were receiving the Body of Christ. The attitude of

either group is that the Divinity must be satisfied with whatever He is given.

Due in no small degree to this spirit of legalistic compromise so common among the vast majority of Catholics, the Revolutionary movement in the Church has achieved unimpeded and astounding headway. And no real unity among true Catholics will ever be possible until the principle I am here belaboring is accepted–*that the "New Mass" is totally irredeemable*. If enough good Catholics took their stand on this matter tomorrow, the tide would be turned the day after. Moreover, until this principle is adopted, "concerned Catholics" can have their indignant meetings, sign their petitions, wrangle for "concessions," agitate for catechetical reforms, start their own schools, stylize their "Latin masses," multiply their Rosaries, and campaign for any one of a hundred other worthy Catholic causes. At best they will achieve a holding or delaying action—an optimistic hope, but not a realistic one. More likely, they will continue disunited, ignored, pushed aside, and trampled underfoot.

Validity of Consecration is required by the Church's law. And it is the obedience to this law which makes the offering acceptable to God. Such obedience, so unpalatable to the "modern" spirit which is now all-pervasive in the Church, is in exact accord with the true spirit of the Roman Rite. According to the "modern" spirit, that which is voluntary, free, and enthusiastic is better than that which is done in obedience. The dichotomy of the Church's law on the one hand, and this false spirit on the other, is most deceptive and unreal. The *true* spirit of Catholicism teaches that obedience is part of justice and that justice is at the heart of charity. Those who truly *love* God most, *obey* Him best. The essence of supernatural love is the renunciation of self for God's sake: "He that shall lose his life for Me, shall find it" (Mt. 10:39). And further, "If you love

Me, keep My commandments" (Jn. 14:15). The joy of loving is not the cause of love. The joy of loving comes not from the act of loving, but from pleasing him who is loved:

> *If you keep My commandments, you shall abide in My love; as I also have kept My Father's commandments, and do abide in His love.*
>
> *These things I have spoken to you, that My joy may be in you, and our joy may be filled.*
>
> John 15:10–11

Validity of Consecration, if I may say it again, is required by the Church's law. And it is the obedience to this law which makes the offering acceptable to God. You know well that the Sacrifice on Calvary of Christ, the most innocent Son of Mary, was a truly worthy Oblation, sufficient for the salvation of all men, efficacious for the redemption of the *Elect*. It was so, not because of the certainty of the Son of Man's death, but because His death was the "consummation of" (Jn. 19:30) His life of perfect obedience to the commands of God, His Father; it was the minutest fulfillment of all the prophecies concerning it, to which Jesus felt bound, as to a law.

> *These are the words which I spoke to you, while I was yet with you, that all things must needs be fulfilled, which are written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning Me.*
>
> Luke 24:44

In the True Mass the fact of the validity of the consecration is taken for granted. The dominant concern and oft-repeated prayer is that the Act and those who are celebrating it may be found worthy by Him to Whom it is offered. If you page

through the Ordinary of the Mass in your old missal, you will see many petitions to this effect. Let me cite a few:

As he ascends to the altar, the priest prays: (*Aufer a Nobis*) "Take away from us our iniquities, we beseech Thee, O Lord, that with pure minds we may worthily enter into the holy of holies." During the Offertory, the celebrant asks that the chalice "ascend in the sight of Thy divine majesty with a sweet savor…" Then he bows low and begs: "In the spirit of humility and with a contrite heart receive us, O Lord, and grant that the sacrifice which we offer this day in Thy sight, may be pleasing unto Thee, O Lord God." (As noted before, all these prayers have been suppressed in the "*Novus Ordo*.")

The *Orate Fratres* invites the people: "Brethren, pray that my sacrifice and yours may be acceptable to God the Father almighty."

A classic instance of the shameless meretriciousness of the so-called "reform" of the liturgy is its claim to be a restoration of primitive forms of the old Roman Church. Yet the "reform" makes optional the recitation of the ancient Canon, whose invariable and unchangeable nature was completely characteristic of the Romanesque tradition. A more specific instance of the same thing is the leaving to the mood of the celebrant whether he will say the fifth prayer of the Canon, the *Quam Oblationem*, which perfectly expresses the relationship between liceity and validity of which we are speaking. The *Quam Oblationem* expresses this relationship by drawing its spirit, and even its vocabulary, from the days of the ancient Republic of Rome, where the dominant theme and necessity of life, both individual and civil, were reverence for and conformity to law as the source and staff of order, peace, and stability. This prayer has a repetitive, legal style about its formation. And to add further emphasis to its thought, the

priest makes no less that five signs of the cross over the sacred species, soon to be transubstantiated.

> *Quam oblationem, tu, Deus, in omnibus quaesumus, benedictam, adscriptam, ratam, rationabilem, acceptabliemque facere digneris: ut nobis Corpus et Sanguis fiat dilectissimi Filii tui Domini nostri Jesu Christi*.
>
> (Which oblation do Thou, O God, vouchsafe in all things to bless, approve, ratify, make worthy and acceptable: that it may become for us the Body and Blood of Thy most beloved Son Our Lord Jesus Christ.)

No other language can do full justice to the thought, but here is something of the idea: The priest asks that the Oblation be given a blessing which will render it perfect in every respect, ("*oblationem in omnibus benedictam*"). That this might be so, the offerings must bear a certificate ("*adscriptam*"); the blessing being requested must impart this. The "*ratam*" means that it must have about it all those qualities which the law requires, in order that the law might be most rigidly, precisely and fully obeyed. In this word, there is a resonance of the "*Consummatum est*" of the Crucifixion. The "*rationabilem*" means that it must be a living, enspirited, vibrant, even *willing* offering, a ready victim:

> *For it is impossible that with the blood of oxen and goats sin should be taken away.*
>
> *Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith: Sacrifice and oblation thou wouldest not: but a body thou hast fitted to me:*
>
> *Holocausts for sin did not please thee.*
>
> *Then said I: Behold I come; in the head of the book it is written of me, that I should do thy will, O God.*
>
> Hebrews 10:4–7

Thus, while he repeatedly gestures toward the humble elements of bread and wine with signs of the cross, the celebrant beseeches God to make them into what His own law requires, so that He Himself might find them acceptable. He only can render them so. And the only Things which will perfectly satisfy these requirements are the Body and Blood of His very own Son, *Corpus et Sanguis dilectissimi Filii tui Domini nostri Jesu Christi*.

You see, therefore, that the law of God for His worship must be most carefully obeyed if He is to find this Rite worthy and acceptable. *Liceity predominates over, includes, and necessitates the validity of Consecration.* The Sacrifice will be worthy if the law is carefully followed, and it can only be licit if that which is sacrificed is the Lamb of God.

This same theme is to be found in another prayer, which "progress" decreed was unfit for the Mass, the *Placeat*, which in the True Mass the priest recites just before the final blessing. There is not a more perfect, nor a more appropriate prayer in the entire Missal, even if it is a mere thousand years old or so.

> May the homage of my bounden duty be pleasing to Thee, O Holy Trinity; and grant that the sacrifice which I, though unworthy, have offered in the sight of Thy Majesty may be acceptable to Thee, and through Thy mercy be a propitiation for me and for all those for whom I have offered it. Through Christ Our Lord. Amen.

The priest has offered the Sacrifice in fulfillment of a divinely-imposed duty. And the manner of its offering has not been according to his own devising, but according to the long-hallowed law of the Church. It was for him to

"make the Sign" of the Sacrifice, *as the law required*. He was assured that *thereby,* the Divine Majesty would be suitably worshipped and the fruits and graces would be bestowed in return. It was by this obedience that the Act of the Mass was accomplished. We watched his meticulous observance and knew that our Oblation was being properly made and that the Divine King was sacramentally present. We read from his actions his intentions to do what the Church intends by this Rite.

The "New Mass" is a violation of one of the strictest laws of the Church. There is no way to justify it. Those priests who attempt to salvage mere validity of consecration from it, by certain kinds of "improvisations," do us no service at all. *What law are they keeping?* They are only slightly less blameworthy than their more honest brother-priests, who unhesitatingly "say" the "New Mass." Nor do the efforts of the former assure us of anything except perhaps their cowardice, insecurity, and the like. They are breaking the same law as their blindly confident confreres. What reward therefore shall they have? They, like the knowing pawns, are serving the cause of the Revolution satisfactorily enough because lawlessness and deviousness never fail to further its end. They are tacitly collaborating with the conspirators while breaking both the true laws and the invalid ones. *They are creating their own liturgy!* If *they* may do such a thing, how can they find fault with those who simply *follow* the rite of the "*Novus Ordo*?" What is more, they are doing no good by their circuities. The people are in no way benefited; they are being involved in the same rancid sacrilege, made no less grievous by their ignorance of the fact. God is not being honored by the imaginative inventions of these clerical expedientists.

F. The Dishonoring of Mary

And, in this connection, we should call attention to the mere token deference given in the "New Mass" to Mary, the Most Blessed Mother of God. It must be recognized that the few begrudging mentions of her represent nothing more than vestiges of the loving attentions paid her in the True Mass. The few references made to her in the "*Novus Ordo*" were kept only in order to placate the faithful, you may be sure. There is no more place in the "New Religion" for Our Lady than there is for Christ Our Lord. This is a point which needs further comment.

First however, I cannot emphasize strongly enough that the ultimate purpose of all the sacrileges, the trickery, the lawlessness, the discord, and the scandal in religion, as well as of the overthrow of governments, the terrorism, the cruelties, the imprisonments, the murders, and the ruin of souls in the social realm, which are the stock and trade of the Revolution– the ultimate purpose of them all, I say, is the everlasting blasphemy of the sweet Name of Jesus, the God-Man. For the doctrine which inspires in Revolutionaries the most unmitigated hatred and provokes all their audacious perversities is that of His sacred divinity. Once you become aware of this fact, you will be able to comprehend the (poorly) disguised intentions of the "New Mass," and, to be sure, of the whole drive for "renewal" in the Church.

Now, according to the logic of the Revolution, Mary must at every opportunity be slighted and ignored, and if possible, reviled. It goes without saying that the Revolutionaries cannot endure her presence—she being the Immaculate One and they being interiorly depraved. It would suit the purpose of the Revolution if we would do either one of two things: on the one hand, forget all

about Mary–cease to pray to her or sing her praises; or, on the other, give her divine worship. Either error will deflect from the glory which she shares and the love she inspires for her divine Son and will serve well enough. It is a lamentable fact that many will tolerate greater insolence towards her Son than towards her. They will rise to her defense with admirable courage; whereas they will participate with docility, and in some cases with enthusiasm, in the unspeakable Insult to Her Son which is the "New Mass." Nothing could displease her more. Her place at Mass has been usurped and her fervent votaries should have noticed it (not that she would ever attend the Spectacle). But if anyone has, through the centuries, always been thought to "preside" at the Eucharistic Sacrifice of Her Son, it is she, just as she did on Calvary.

All of us should have been put on our guard a number of years ago when the genuflection was taken from the Creed of the Mass at the words, "*Et incarnatus est de Spiritu Sancto, ex Maria Virgine, et homo factus est*" ("And was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man"). The enemies of Christ realize the significance of these little acts of reverence, even if we do not. Mention of the Incarnation and the Virgin Birth fills them with revulsion, even if it does not fill us with pride.

At the same time, they achieved a still greater triumph. It was no aesthetic concern for liturgy which dictated that the Last Gospel, the magnificent Prologue of the Gospel of St. John, had to be refined out; rather, it was the vicious repugnance which Revolutionaries are taught to feel for the very mention of the Incarnation and the Divinity of Our Lord. This triumph, indeed, they counted as one of their most unexpected and most

symbolic victories in their long-range Program to destroy the Mass completely.

G. The Purpose of Archaism

I have already touched upon what is referred to by true liturgists as the error of "archaism," that is, an exaggerated attachment to the early Church. And I quoted Pope Pius XII's encyclical warning against it, which, as you know, has been sedulously forgotten. Like some old people, the "new religionists" remember the remote past (and only that part of it which suits their purposes) much, much better than yesterday. They seem to have adopted the phrase, "in the Early Church," just as communist groups in America and around the world adopted the slogan, "End the war!" Both expressions are used with equal mindlessness. "In the Early Church" is the main (and almost the only) reason given for tearing the Church asunder nowadays. You will hear these words to explain why laymen should be allowed to distribute Holy Communion and should receive it in their hands, why priests need not wear vestments, why the Blessed Sacrament need not be kept in churches at all, why the churches should be stripped of every sign of religion and scraped to their gray concrete and rough-hewn timbers. These words are also the reason why sisters should not wear habits, priest should marry, popes are unnecessary, discipline is a nuisance, and Christ is not divine. It is not at all surprising to hear such things from the lips of present-day high school students who (you are certain) know less about the Church in its primitive days than they know about astrophysics or biochemistry.

In any such discussion, if you go one step further and ask your apologist *why* all of a sudden in the 1970's everything should be done exactly as it was done in the Early Church,

usually you will receive absolute silence for an answer, or much stammering, or silly, laughable imaginings. The true answer to this question is very useful to have, however, so let us hasten to give it.

The pretended loyalty to the Early Church serves the purpose of suggesting that its fervor was never again equaled, that it resembles the current fervor for renewal, and that the Church has been in the state of progressive deterioration from those days to these. It will be remembered that the old Protestant Reformers also told their followers they were returning to primitive usages. In doing so, the Protestant purpose was simply to negate, with a single stroke, the development of the Church. Their "Reform," therefore, was a not very subtle way of denying and bringing the people to deny, all those doctrines which have become *explicit* in the Faith and in the Prayer of the Church. The ecumenical advantage of our present regression to the Early Church should be clear—it is an implicit way of ceasing to profess any Christian truths which Protestants refuse to accept to this very day. No wonder, therefore, many Protestants think this "updating" craze in our Church is a promising thing! The slight and begrudging attention given the most holy Mother of God in the "New Mass" is a certain example of this artifice, and there are many others.

Hence also, if you wish to play "ecumenics" with the Jews, you just continue *further* back into history, into the Old Testament. And if you think I am trying to be funny, tell me what reason has been given for allowing the fulfillment of one's Sunday obligation on Saturday and his holyday obligation on the day preceding. "*They*" say that, in the Bible, the day went from sunset to sunset. This is *pure* Judaism, of course. *Never* in the entire history of the Church was there such a practice. (In the Early Church, the people kept a vigil till midnight before

celebrating their feasts—but we are not supposed to know that.) Further, the old Holy Saturday and Vigil of Pentecost liturgies lent themselves perfectly to this ancient practice. But they have been discarded.

H. The Rite of Peace

A perfect example of how this archaism has been adopted to serve the true purpose of the Revolution is to be found in the Rite of Peace of the "New Liturgy." It is given out as a revival of the ancient rite of the Kiss of Peace, as it was performed in the Early Church, a vestige of which remains in Solemn High Masses in the Roman liturgy. The great emphasis placed upon it indicates its importance in the plans of the manipulators. Together with the Communion, or "Love-Feast," it makes up what might be called the high point of the service.

Shortly after the *Our Father*, we are instructed, according to the Paluch Company *Missalette*, to "express wishes of peace and love toward one another in words and gestures of our own choosing."[64] What is wanted is a warm embrace. A hand-shake will keep one out of trouble, but it is not exactly in the spirit of the thing. In some places, there is much kissing. The idea is that all should give some genuine, physical sign of their Christian love. They should make the rounds, get acquainted with strangers. It should be a kind of "happy hour" without the drinks; each should be overjoyed to see his brothers and sisters and indicate as much.

The signification claimed for this "ceremony" is that Christ is truly present in the hearts of all who have love for one another. "*Ubi caritas est. Deus ibi est*" ("Where charity is, there God is.") Through these warm touches and embraces true

[64] *Monthly Missalette*. J.S. Paluch Co., Inc. Chicago. June, 1971, p. 28.

charity is being expressed and communicated. Communal spirit is not only being symbolized, but actually put into practice and learned in the doing. Christ said, "Go first to be reconciled to they brother" (Mt. 5:24).

The Rite of Peace, joined with the Penitential Rite, in which all confess to their brothers and sisters, is that act of reconciliation with one's brothers, enjoined by Christ. It is therefore a perfect preparation for the reception of Christ in the Eucharist. By thus making peace with one's brethren, a person is allowing himself to be liberated; he is finding himself in the community of the Church and manifesting both the personal and communal peace which Christ alone can give.

In order for this peace to be given in great abundance, all barriers which divide those present must be allowed to fall. This is the time when the saying of the Greek Apostle is being fulfilled: "There is neither Jew nor Greek; there is neither bond nor free: there is neither male nor female. For you are all one in Christ Jesus" (Gal. 3:28). It goes without saying that the greeting of peace is to be given to all present. Special efforts should be made to make non-Catholics feel included. In fact, it would be a serious breach of charity to exclude anyone due to his creed, race, national origins, or political persuasion. Likewise, the fact that some in the congregation may be living in mortal sin, or may be excommunicated due to a bad marriage (or to his having left the priesthood without proper dispensation), etc., should not be allowed to interfere. To do so would spoil the whole idea of the peace which is celebrated by this rite. It is not the time and place for such factors to be considered. What is important is that everyone present give himself to his brothers and sisters and allow the natural communication of the peace of Christ to flow from each into all. Everyone should cast aside his own timidity, self-consciousness, and

selfishness. He must, as it were, hand himself over to the community, allow himself to become a part of it, make himself an ingredient in the communal blend. This is what the "New Liturgy" means.

It is to be hoped by the time of the Rite of Peace comes, everyone will be ready to join in enthusiastically and joyously. Under ideal circumstances, the service "builds up" to this phase of the "mass." Let us consider how this build-up has been structured into the "New Mass" taken in its entirety.

At this point, I supply "New Mass" "presidents" with a few helpful hints for a more successful Rite of Peace. After all, they may not have discovered yet the inherent dynamism of the "New Mass," nor realized that there is an ultimate fulfillment which the brothers and sisters are expected to arrive at. If everything is properly arranged, and everyone pointed in the right direction, success is assured. It would be nothing short of tragic for the brothers and sisters to miss out on this!

The president can do much to evoke spontaneity and meaningfulness in this part of the service by making the proper arrangements, though he should not actually *dictate* what the service is going to be. He should do everything possible to get those who will attend to pitch in on it. They can help him choose the music, find the right musicians, decorate the church, etc. They will be able to come up with ideas he could never have thought of. For instance, they know what kind of music they like; in some cases he may not even know what's popular. And how would it be if he used something that they didn't even *know*, or something that has been off the lists for a couple of months! If the people did not know the "numbers," they would not be able to let themselves go the way they have

to. They have to be able to enjoy themselves, throw themselves into the action, get caught up in the rhythms. Doing so has a wonderfully liberating effect on everybody; it allows him to praise God and at the same time to become one with the assembled group. The idea is that all together become one voice, one heart, one being. This is how each discovers what true freedom is and comes to realize how he needs the others, that as a Christian, he is already a part of the others and has yet to learn to show it. The "mass" is supposed to be an experience of love.

Throughout, for the best effect, things should be kept moving; the people should be kept singing. The guitar is decidedly the best instrument for the melody line, though, of course, the prolonged beating of drums excites people, whether they want it to or not. It is good if there are multi-colored banners around; pictures and posters chosen by participants help to create atmosphere, help everyone to relate to each other. All the senses should be appealed to. Get as many people as possible involved in the decorating; it doesn't matter if it is poor art, so long as it is the work of the people, something that they can consider part of themselves. They may even want a procession around the church at the time of the Presentation of Gifts. This kind of thing makes everyone realize that the Church is related to the times. Processions are like protest marches—marches of the people—a phenomenon of twentieth-century life. The more activity that can be incited into the greatest number of people, the better things will go.

At the Penitential Rite, all confess to each other. This should be a heartfelt renunciation of all selfishness, prejudice, and chauvinism. For these are the things which divide people. Each person must realize and should overcome any hesitancy about being at complete ease during "mass." The new thinking is that this is the perfect time and place for one to

reach out to others in a spirit of love and acceptance and self-giving. The heartfelt participation of all in the responses and singing will assist greatly toward helping each one release himself into the community.

It is important that the commentaries which interlard the various parts of the "mass" contain ideas of reconciliation, forgiveness, love, surrender, peace, and generosity. Just the repetition of these words helps orient those present toward the Rite of Peace. Moreover, it is highly important that the president, or whoever gives the homily, dwell on these themes. Equally necessary is saying nothing which may cause divisions or discord or embarrassment among the brothers and sisters. He should, for example, avoid mentioning such ideas as the "Church," or the "papacy," which to many, represent the Establishment, a very dissonant concept. Similarly jarring are words like "the law," "sin," "self-discipline," "grace," and "the Judgment." It should not be necessary to say it, but just in case the question should come up, all controversial issues should be skirted, such as the divinity of Jesus, the Resurrection, the existence of the devil or Hell, etc. It has been found best to dwell on social needs and projects.

With a little trouble and imagination, you can achieve some real momentum during the Eucharistic Prayer. There is enough time *really* to set the stage, so to speak. Some may go for the idea of turning the lights down during this period; it kind of suggests the Upper Room. Then you can read the narrative of the Last Supper. Make sure they don't miss this. Its purpose is to set the scene for the Rite of Peace. The Last Supper was the communal meal of Jesus with His Apostles. That was the time He gave them the symbol of unity and brotherhood, the Eucharist.

If all has gone according to plan, by the time the Rite of Peace comes, the people will be ready to show how much they have enjoyed having the "mass" with each other. It will be easy for all to circulate freely. Those who hardly knew each other will find they have been drawn together just by having assembled and given themselves to the communal action.

The climax comes when they have their meal together. Nothing is more pleasant and friendly than a meal shared with those one loves. And by now, everyone will feel that he loves everyone else and will have a glow, as it were. And all the while, let the music continue to play upon them, soothe and refresh and stimulate them.

Some may be inclined to accuse me of exaggerating. That is because they have not admitted what the "New Mass" is, when it is carried to its logical conclusions. What I have said above is descriptive of its true intentions, for which the evidence is so abundant it is hard to escape, which intentions are easily discernible in the very make-up of the "New Mass." The meaning is that no matter how this Impropriety is carried out in a typical parish church, the same underlying implications are present and are *having their effect*.

This fact should need no proving. But consider that according to the Code of Canon Law, only those who are in good standing in the Church should be allowed to participate in liturgical functions, that is, fulfill a role in the ceremonies. Others, such as excommunicated persons and non-Catholics may (or must, as the case may be) *attend only*. For the Rite of Peace, this injunction should also cover those who, though not excommunicated, are known to be living in sin. Since they are obviously rejecting the peace of Christ by their way of life, this

should go without saying. Did not Our Lord say: "And if the son of peace be there, your peace shall rest upon him; But if not, it shall return to you" (Luke 10:6).

What Catholic church is there today which does not encourage all in attendance to take part in the Rite of Peace? Such a question may strike the reader as unkind. That of course is the point. That it appears unkind is sufficient indication how the thinking of the "New Religion" has affected everyone. And yet, it was for just such reasons as we are speaking of that the kiss of peace ceased to be given among the lay people in the traditional liturgy. Rather than violate the truth and the spirit of the ceremony on the one hand, and rather than be forced to exclude particular individuals on the other, it was found necessary so to abbreviate it.

As mentioned earlier, the "reformers" claim to be restoring this rite to its ancient usage. It serves their purpose not to recall that "in the Early Church" only believers were permitted to attend the Mass proper. As time went on, it was found advisable to have the men and women take separate places, the men on the one side, the women on the other. It need not be said that, in those days, according to the true spirit of worship, there was nothing of the "old home week" idea about the rite. Also, that women dressed like street-walkers might be allowed to enter the church was unthinkable.

It is plainly contrary to all reason for anyone and everyone to be permitted, even encouraged, to take part in such a ceremony. The peace of Christ cannot exist between His friends and those who, for whatever reason, refuse to accept His total sovereignty over them. His peace resides in the heart of the man who adheres to Him through the theological virtues of faith, hope, and charity. Peace is the fruit of such a relationship. Peace among men, the peace which is supposed to exist in the Catholic community, is the unity and harmony

which exists among those who share this relationship of union with Christ. The union of all is in Christ. Christ Our Lord, then, is the source and bond of their unity. The Blessed Eucharist is both the cause and the perfect symbol of this unity, as the Church, the Mystical Body of Christ, is the visible embodiment of it. Such a communion of peace and love is impossible among people who are indisposed for, or uninterested in, or incredulous of, the Mystery of the Eucharist and the Truth of Catholicism.

Yet, the undeniable implication of the Rite of Peace in the "New Liturgy" is that no supernatural basis for peace, charity, or fraternity is necessary, or, as far as anyone can judge, even exists. It is no accident that while all the glad-handing is taking place, Christ (if the Consecration of the host has been valid) remains on the "altar" alone and unattended and almost certainly forgotten.

Some may argue: "You are suggesting that to perform this rite is to neglect and dishonor Christ." I most certainly am. This "rite" falsely suggests that all the feigned and forced friendliness is in honor of Christ, Who is (allegedly) physically present on the "altar." My argument is very simple. This rite does not unite one with his neighbor in the Eucharistic Christ; *it pits his neighbor against Christ*. It says, in effect, that those present are failing in love if, during these most precious and solemn moments when Jesus of Nazareth is passing by, they do not turn away from Him and fuss over their brothers and sisters. This rite makes it an obligation, a strict duty of charity, to turn away from Christ and to devote oneself to the greeting and salutation of his fellows.

It may be objected: "But in the 'Old Mass' there was the kiss of peace. This is just the same thing, except that now all the people participate." I have already discussed some of the ways in which the Rite of Peace in the "New Mass" is not at all the

same thing as the kiss of peace in the True Mass, in that it includes everyone present, regardless of his condition of soul and relationship to the Church. If there had been any dishonor to the Divine Majesty in the ceremony of the kiss of peace as it has been practiced in the Church for many, many centuries, the great saints would have prevailed upon the popes to suppress it. The old rite needs no defense.

What I am saying here is that the Rite of Peace in the "*Novus Ordo*" is something patently and intrinsically different. It is indefensible. It is another and most striking instance of how, by seemingly minor adjustments, the "New Mass" has the people worshipping themselves, instead of God. "The people is Baal." If there is any time in the whole "mass" when absolutely no need exists for those present to concern themselves with each other and begin to act as if, after having been together since the beginning of the service, they have just discovered long-lost friends, if there is *any* time, I say, it is at this period of the "mass." Otherwise nothing could prevent them from spending the rest of the day with each other once "mass" is over, just a few moments later. Imagine it: at just the time when every mind and heart should be bent on the adoration of Christ and preparation for Communion, all are supposed to begin to "pal around" with each other! The "liturgists" have the nerve to call this a symbolic action. It is that indeed; it is an incomparable symbol of the scorn Satan has for the Blessed Jesus and those who adore Him.

The only thing truly required of those present for the new Rite of Peace is that they join in, which suggests another unaccidental turn-about: those who perceive the sacrilegious impiousness of this light-headed socializing and who for reasons of conscience refuse to participate, those who do cherish their union with Christ enough not to offend Him

thus, become, by their refusal, *outsiders!* They are regarded as uncooperative, uncharitable, and even defiant of the laws of the Church, and, incredible to say, as irreverent! It should be plain that the true basis of this "love-making," as the "New Order" imposes it, is simply "being human" and not minding participation in it. In a word, the thing is sheerest paganism. Indeed, it is worse because it claims to be religious; pagans usually know the difference. The Rite of Peace *celebrates* a fiction, a falsity! It implies that Christ is present and is imparting His own Spirit of love and joy to all who are taking part in an act which He cannot but find hypocritical and loathsome.

Not only is there nothing in this silliness worthy of Christ's truth, but we must see it as really a form of Revolutionary "Sensitivity Training." These words have gotten to be a technical term. "Sensitivity Training" refers to contrived situations in which people, knowingly or otherwise, are subjected to a process of "depersonalization," or better, "communization." In such situations, they are seduced into saying and doing things which implicitly, sometimes very explicitly, go counter to their own personal beliefs, clear knowledge, and natural inclinations. They are cornered into violating their own natures and personalities and consciences.

The aim of the Revolution is to demoralize, corrupt, and dehumanize us. It would have us renounce our Faith, our need of Christ and of His Sacrifice, even our inner spiritual selves and our individualities. Such a renunciation is necessary in order that we become the complete possession of the community.

When the Revolution speaks of peace, it means "surrender." In the context of the Rite of Peace, "Peace be to you" means: "May you surrender yourself completely to the new rules and programs and desensitizing manipulations of your handlers.

Under this regimen you must be convinced that it is blameworthy obduracy on your part not to accept and welcome, *with feeling*, your own depersonalization."

Now you can understand why in the "*Confiteor*" you must confess to your brothers and your sisters; you must think as sins all those things which keep you from being one with the community. The new, fanatical insistence on participation has a similar purpose. The Revolution cannot tolerate the solitary man, the self-possessed man, the contemplative, *the man who does not need to be forced to conform.*

The Revolution incessantly repeats the word "freedom." What it means by this word is that every man should free himself from the laws and self-preserving instincts of his own nature, that he should dispossess himself of all inner strength, restraint, and virtue, to say nothing of the inner dominance of Christ by His truth and grace. The purpose of corrupting a person is to put him at the disposal of his fallen nature; the purpose of destroying his faith and of dispossessing him of all certainty is that he will have to be controlled from without. The Revolution means to unshackle a man interiorly, that it may have the excuse of encircling him with the mindless mob (which the "Community" is), of regimenting him, binding him, and putting him under guard. Despising virtue, which is man's mastery of himself by the power of Christ, even being unable to comprehend it, the Revolution cannot conceive a community of truly free men, nor the idea of peace through the rule of the Spirit of God.

The true Revolutionary cannot stand to be alone, to be in silence, to be inactive. In such a condition he would either go mad or find God. Because of his own spiritual vacuity and restlessness, and because of his conceited passion for ruling, for managing others, he cannot permit anyone to be alone. In the *traditional* liturgy, having learned from long and loving

experience, the Church has arranged periods of silence. It exhorts him who comes to Mass to search his soul, to admit his sinfulness, to express his sorrow, to implore the Father of good gifts for strength, light, charity, and peace, for all that is necessary to serve Him. The time after the Our Father is to be spent preparing for the great moment of Communion, when Christ the King enters the body and the soul and holds secret tryst. "Heart speaks to heart." The time after Communion until the end of Mass is all too brief, so we are urged to remain and continue to give our souls to God alone, that He might in His turn and according to His measureless goodness, bestow his Godly powers, His tender mercy, and His peace, such as the world cannot give.

With the introduction of the "New Mass" we have been given to understand that these beautiful manifestations of the sanity, purity, and wisdom of the Roman Rite were all wrong, and must be curtailed. Yes, I know, they will tell you: "No, we are not saying all these things were wrong; they are just out-of-date." Either way, it is a lie.

According to the thinking embodied in the "New Mass," charity and communal harmony require you to busy yourself doing something with everyone else—sing along, march around, listen to the commentator, go here, go there. In the Rite of Peace, all are saying, "peace, peace." But there is no peace. They will not leave you alone that you may find any. Therefore, true to the unfailing policy and method of the Revolution, probably that which has caused more disturbance, distraction, anger (totally justified), and dissension than any other of all the detestable innovations in the "New Mass" is this execrable, artificiality called the "Rite of Peace."

This "rite" has been introduced by those very men who are supposed to be pastors and men of peace. Yet they have

been so "communized," that they are incapable of seeing the effects of their own brutality, the sorrow and distress of the best of God's people.

As these good people will tell a priest whom they trust, "We go to pray, we remain to fulfill an obligation, we come home to weep. Father, what shall we do?" I for one will say, "Do not go back there, but do not surrender."

How truly symbolic is the "Rite of Peace." It begins with the "president." From him, it spreads among his prisoners. He has no peace in his own soul because he is involved to his very ears in the Great Sacrilege. He is, at that moment, committing another mortal sin. He now wishes the others, "Peace." Yes, "surrender." He and his confreres have been busy trying to pacify the consciences and placate the indignation of the people for many months now, telling them that they must accept "the changes"—that it is virtuous to go along, that they must surrender their wills and reasons to the authority of the Church, and that the pope can do no wrong. No lie, no subterfuge is impossible to these "peace-keepers." They are no longer shepherds; now they are herders.

The "presidents" may take consolation in the fact that they have done their work well. The planners of the Revolution knew from the beginning that they could find no more effective hands than those of priests. The process of the "pacification" of the people has succeeded surprisingly well under their ministrations. By now, the great majority of the faithful have lost all will to resist. They now come to church dutifully, listen dumbly to any sort of vomitable mismash, blare out any vapid chanty, say, "We beseech you to hear us" to any entreaty, be it sane or silly, shell out thousands and thousands for the denudation of their churches, or for the building of new prayer-halls, compel their children to submit to any

perversion (in the public schools they will do it for nothing), and do all this smilingly, songfully. They have become numbers, faces, bodies, sheep—the "Community"—the Commune! What more could a "president" want? Or a commissar, for that matter!

I. The "Communion"

So much having been said, little imagination is required to anticipate what the devisers of the "New Religion" want the Communion of their "mass" to be. After the merry-making of the Rite of Peace, everyone should be in a jovial enough mood to share a little "supper" as a sign of their freshly renewed affection and a kind of "memorial" of their chummy get-together. "Communion" in the "New Mass" is nothing more than a restoration of the ancient agape, the love-feast. In the very early days of the Church, it was a meal which followed the celebration of the Mass. St. Paul mentions it only to scold the people for their use of it to desecrate the Mass.

> *When you come therefore together into one place, it is not now to eat the Lord's supper.*
>
> *For every one taketh beforehand his own supper to eat. And one indeed is hungry and another is drunk.*
>
> *What, have you not houses to eat and to drink in? Or despise ye the church of God: and put them to shame that have not? What shall I say to you? Do I praise you? In this I praise you not.*
>
> 1 Corinthians 11:20–22

What would this "Great Lion of God" say about the goings-on in "Catholic" churches today?

May I call your attention at this point to Pope Paul VI's "decree" *Missale Romanum* (Appendix II). Truly it is one of the most curious writings in the annals of the papacy. And it is appropriate that we take notice of it here. This "decree" should be read carefully, for it is a classic example of "Pauline" circumlocution and eel-like ambiguity. You will notice throughout, for instance, the Pope nowhere clearly and dogmatically delineates the Catholic doctrine of the Holy Sacrifice, and, more particularly, that of the Blessed Eucharist. On the contrary, by a studied effort, he chooses his words so that they are easily susceptible of a Protestant interpretation. Presumably, Protestant ministers do read this "decree." If so, they find nothing in the present day official understanding of the Church concerning the "mass" which prohibits their participation in it.

The Pope speaks of the three principal parts of the Mass, the Offertory, the Consecration, and the Communion, only to indicate that the "reform" has required their "simplification":

> Also to be eliminated are elements which, with the passage of time, came to be duplicated, or were added with but little advantage, above all in the rites of offering the bread and wine, and in those of the breaking of the bread and of communion.[65]

The Offertory, as we have seen, has been suppressed.

Now, how many Catholics know that the term "the breaking of the bread" (the "*Fractio Panis*") is a scriptural phrase which the early Christians used to refer to the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass (Acts 2:42)? But you must realize that no Protestant thinks of the term in that way. The unavoidable question is, why does Pope Paul use this

[65] Appendix II Par. 7.

expression to refer to the Consecration, since among Catholics it is by no means a normal way of speaking of it. He pretends that this expression is quite familiar to us, but it is not, anymore than it is natural for us to refer to each other as "brothers and sisters."

Now read the following excerpt from Pope Paul VI's *Missale Romanum*:

> All this [he says] is wisely ordered in such a way that there is developed more and more among the faithful a "hunger for the Word of God" (Amos 8:11), which, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, leads the people of the New Covenant to the perfect unity of the Church. We are fully confident that both priests and faithful will prepare their hearts more devoutly and together at the Lord's Supper, meditating more profoundly on sacred Scripture, and at the same time they will nourish themselves more day by day with the words of the Lord. It will follow then that according to the wishes of the Second Vatican Council, sacred Scripture will be at the same time a perpetual source of spiritual life, an instrument of prime value for transmitting Christian doctrine, and finally the center of all theology.[66]

This is from a comparatively long explanation of how the sacred Scriptures have been given a great prominence in the "New Mass." I ask you to take careful note:

First, the imagery which we Catholics normally associate with the *reception* of the Body of Our Lord is used throughout in connection with our *hearing of the reading of the Scriptures*. Second, Holy Communion is given the *Protestant* terminology, the "Lord's Supper." Third, *not the reception of the Blessed*

[66] Appendix II, Par. 10

Eucharist but the hearing of the word of God "leads the people of the New Covenant to the unity of the Church" (typical Protestant biblical phraseology). Fourth, the reception of Holy Communion is intertwined with the listening to the word of God, which occurs during the early part of the "mass." Fifth, the reception of the Eucharist is strictly communal—no mention of the personal union of the soul with its Spouse and King. (The community, in case it needs to be said, cannot receive sacraments, only its members; but further, you should be a member of the Mystical Body of Christ to do so.) Sixth, the *community*, having shared the "Lord's Supper," will nourish themselves, not on the Body of Christ, but "with the words of the Lord!" Seventh, again, as if to identify the words of Christ with the Word in the Flesh, the Pope says, the sacred Scriptures, not the Blessed Eucharist will be "a perpetual source of the spiritual life." Eighth, nowhere in all this discussion about the Holy Scriptures does the Pope warn that its interpretation is strictly subject to the divine magisterium of the Church, and understandably enough. No Protestant would hear of such a thing!

There is not a line in all this writing that is heretical, you understand. Yet, with such words as these, the bishop of Rome, the successor of St. Peter, whose patronal namesake is the "Apostle of the Gentiles," the spiritual sovereign of the world introduces his Revolutionary Instrument. For this incredible "decree" stands in the same place in the *Novus Ordo Missae* as *Quo Primum* does in the *Missale Romanum.*

J. "Ecumenism"

> *And they took the bullock which he gave them, and dressed it; and they called on the name of Baal from morning even till noon, saying: O Baal, hear us. But there*

> *was no voice, nor any that answered: and they leaped over the altar that they had made.*
>
> *And when it was now noon, Elias jested at them, saying: Cry with a louder voice; for he is a god, and perhaps he is talking, or is in an inn, or on a journey, or perhaps he is asleep, and must be awaked.*
>
> *So they cried with a loud voice, and cut themselves after their manner, with knives and lancets, till they were all covered with blood.*
>
> 3 Kings 18:26–28

Protestants need take no comfort at seeing the Mass being "accommodated" to their beliefs, however. The final purpose of the Revolution is *their* subversion also, as many of them know all too well. For its essential motif is not Protestant, but *ecumenical*. Nor is it the true ecumenism which the Church learned early in its history, that of living at peace with non-believers. Even of working with them for truly humane goals, hoping and laboring at the same time to bring them to the knowledge of the hoped-for reunion of various schismatic and heretical Christian bodies with the true Fold of Christ, the Catholic Church. However, in keeping with its character, the Revolution has adopted the term for its own treacherous purposes. What *it* understands by ecumenism is the melting of all religious denominations into the pseudo-religious hash of a *universal brotherhood*. The Revolution calls for abandoning all doctrinal beliefs and moral imperatives as the way to liberty, the dissolution of all churches and nations for the sake of International Communism, and the subordination of all personal rights, possessions, and dignity as the means to absolute equalitarianism. Instead of God, the Revolution worships "man;" instead of Heaven, it promises an earthly utopia—"the Age of Aquarius;" and instead of virtue, it

produces hedonism and utter inhumanity. The so-called "New Mass" is a major step toward the establishment of the universal "Rites of Man," the ritual expression and manifestation of that same spirit which produced the infamous and impudent "Declaration of the Rights of Man" of the French Revolution.

Forever sighing with "love," the "New Mass" frees its participants from the discordant tedium of believing anything. Those who desire to keep their faith are foolish to think they can frequent it, participate in it, and fulfill their religious obligations by it, to say nothing of exposing themselves to it, without danger of absorbing its pseudo-pious heterodoxy and its enervating, corruptive anthropocentrism. True Catholics' mere tolerance of the "New Mass" is an assent to its manifold denials. At the "New Mass," what one believes is unimportant, so long as he does not make trouble, so long as he is "*sincere*," so long as he participates, so long as he allows every form of sacrilege and blasphemy to have its "rightful" place as the "*sincere*" expression of any of the loving brothers and sisters. Some may believe in the doctrine of Transubstantiation; some may not. Some may believe in Heaven and Hell, in the Catholic Church, in the Divine Maternity of the Blessed Virgin Mary; some may believe in absolutely nothing, except "life", or "peace," or "love" (or "Om")! "Let us not say," quoth the Flower Children, "'It is not important.' Rather, let us say, 'It is not important enough that our differences of belief should disrupt our brotherly relationship, that it prevent our loving each other.'" This is to say, in other words, that Divine Truth is less important than human brotherhood.

Adult Catholics haven't caught on yet. They still go to church as if they were attending Mass, still make the same signs of reverence, still keep silence, and still genuflect—whether the Blessed Sacrament is in their churches or not. You may ask,

"Well, is it?" I answer, "Who knows?" Does it matter? It may matter to you of course—or let us hope so—but does it matter to the others who are also in attendance? To your priests? To your bishop? To the pope? If they cared one way or the other would they be a party to the suppression of that liturgy whose every word, rubric, and sign strove to effect, bear witness to and adore, in as worthy a way as is humanly possible, the True Presence of the Crucified Son of God—regardless of what the world thought of it? Would they be party to the forcible and illicit installation of an Activity from which all these have been peremptorily removed (or made removable at the whim of the "president"), and in which there is not one unequivocal affirmation of this ineffable Mystery—lest, mind you, it unkindly offend the sensibilities of those present whose "faith" most unequivocally denies it? Thus the "ecumenism" of the "New Religion."

Obviously, it is the younger set who understand. For the "New Liturgy" speaks to them. They insist on having fun at the "New Mass." "That's what it's for!" There is a generation gap, you see. The young people and their clerical "soul brothers" are the real members of the "Renewed Church." They do not come for Mass; they gather for a "love-feast." They come for a party; so, is it surprising that they should want to act the part, that they should dress like party-goers (irreligious ones at that), haul in their instruments and their loud-speakers, hire players if necessary, sing their favorite songs, and dance if they feel a need? The generation gap with its complete alienation of many, many young people from true Catholicism, is as real as the abominable Copy is from the True Mass. Great discernment is not required to perceive this. True, many young people consider the antics of the "hippie" crowd extreme, and they secretly disdain the "hippie" clergy. This proves nothing about their own faith. The question is: Do they

still believe in the True Church, or would they believe if they knew what it is? Do they accept its moral judgments? Would they accept its authority if it were to begin to command them, as it might? Do they pray as Catholics? No, the most of them have become complete eclectics, claiming for themselves the right and the wisdom to draw their own conclusions and do not imagine God would be less than satisfied. They have become complete subjectivists, and are now the defenseless prey of the Revolution, about which most of them have never heard a word.

The "New Mass" bends towards Protestantism so laboriously that at times it is just plain comical. The handiest example of this fact is the leaving to the decision of the "president" whether to make mention of the names of certain saints, particularly the Apostles and the Roman martyrs. Even though this option is indicated in the "missalettes," undoubtedly many attend the "New Mass" without paying any attention to it. In "Eucharistic Prayer, Form Number One," for instance, brackets thus enclose the names of the following saints:

> We honor Joseph, her husband, the apostles and martyrs Peter and Paul, Andrew, [James, John, Thomas, James, Philip, Bartholomew, Matthew, Simon and Jude; we honor Linus, Cletus, Clement, Sixtus, Cornelius, Cyprian, Lawrence, Chrysogonus, John and Paul, Cosmas and Damian] and all the saints.

Again, after the "Narratio," another list is similarly presented:

> For ourselves, too, we ask some share in the fellowship of your apostles and martyrs, with John the Baptist,

> Stephen, Matthias, Barnabas, [Ignatius, Alexander, Marcellinus, Peter, Felicity, Perpetua, Agatha, Lucy, Agnes, Cecilia, Anastasia] and all the saints.

Perhaps you and I, dear reader, can conjure up a better reason for this unbelievable innovation than I have found in print. The real reason for it, of course, is "ecumenical": Protestants generally accept the fact of the Heavenly beatitude of the Apostles, the Evangelists, St. Stephen and St. Barnabas, because their names are in the Bible. If they do not pray to these glorious persons, they do acknowledge that they are saved. Their problem is an unwillingness to believe that the Church can infallibly declare someone to be in Heaven; consequently, they have no interest in honoring the great Roman martyrs. Our liturgical devisers have none either, needless to say, but they thought it expedient to use the device of making the invocation of these saints *optional* rather than dropping their names outright, having done enough violence to the Canon of the Mass without this.

The *real* reason for this option, then, is to cater to Protestants, but this is not admitted in the "*Novus Ordo*". And it is expected that the ordinary Catholic priest will have another reason for availing himself of this wonderful convenience, he having no desire to compromise an article of faith. The question is, therefore, what *other* and what *good* reason could such a priest have for deciding that *today* he will omit invocation of these thirty-two sainted heroes of our Religion, simple men and women indeed but who once were accused of being extremely dangerous enemies of the Roman Empire and who are truly and infinitely *more* dangerous to the forces of

Revolution, since they possess a power of intercession and miracles, equal to that of some of the angels.

Imagine then: here Father is, standing at the Table, surrounded by unseen hosts of Seraphim and Cherubim, Principalities and Powers, convinced that he is now in the act of fulfilling the majestic prophecy of Malachy which says:

> *For from the rising of the sun even to the going down, my name is great among the Gentiles, and in every place there is sacrifice, and there is offered to my name a clean oblation: for my name is great among the Gentiles, saith the Lord of hosts.*
>
> Malachy 1:11

Here he is, a frail little man, all but annihilated by the proximity of such great heavenly presences and the outbursting power of the sacramental mystery; he is like Peter, James and John on Mount Thabor when Jesus was transfigured before them:

> *And…behold a bright cloud overshadowed them. And lo a voice out of the cloud, saying: This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye him.*
>
> *And the disciples hearing fell upon their face, and were very much afraid.*
>
> Matthew 17:5–6

And now the moment has arrived, when this small being must decide whether he will abbreviate the prayers and ignore the saints, who themselves are within his whisper's reach and who listen for their assignment to assist him and the Church in this divine work of accomplishing the most august Sacrifice. Can you not just hear him now:

"Sorry, Saints, I'll have to leave you out of it today. I'm in a frightful hurry. I spent too much time on the announcements, and the Scripture readings were a bit longer than usual. And it looks as if there will be a lot of communions today. And I have a golf appointment at ten; the fellas will never forgive me if I'm late. But tomorrow I'll check with you, tomorrow for sure. Yes, I know, I said that yesterday; but tomorrow for sure; it's a promise."

K. The Language of the "New Mass"

The reason so very few will wish to agree with these conclusions is not that people are dishonest, cowardly, or unintelligent. It is because, as yet, they have not informed themselves of the mode of thinking and action of the Revolution. Even while soaking up its corrosive incongruities and yielding to its influence, they do not see what they are looking at. They think only in straight lines, in Aristotelian definitions, and in blacks and whites. With regard to the "New Mass," the basic error of most people has been to read traditional meanings and intentions into its language. I cannot emphasize strongly enough what a mistaken approach this is. It is like attempting to prove the personal orthodoxy of Pope Paul VI by referring to certain utterances of his which contain mention of this or that Catholic doctrine. I trust I have made it clear that the question of the legality and validity of this accursed Sham can be decided only through study of those decrees of the Church which are completely reliable and unquestionably binding. How few people realize that *the very soul of the Revolution is deception and its total objective is influence*. The Revolution does not care what people believe. It is totally pragmatic. Sufficient to the Revolution is if its program is working, if the masses are permitting themselves to

be herded, if they are accepting the trends of thought being served to them, if the desired effect is being achieved from whatever cause.

The Revolution has no sympathy for the discontent or the internal revulsion of individuals. It is sufficient if the majority outwardly conforms, thus contributing to the illusion which it is creating for the masses. Individuals who cannot or will not conform must somehow be removed from the others, as they threaten to dispel the illusion for others.

Nor does the Revolution use words as ordinary human beings do. This most people are very slow to learn. Its use of words is as peculiarly its own as is that of the True Church, when those that speak for Catholicism conform their teaching to its divinely-inspired traditions. Language is a means for the furtherance of the Revolutionary program. It is used as a tool, or better, as a weapon, since the program is a phase, and language a tactic in the struggle for influencing people, not for communicating truth. The Revolution is altogether indifferent to objective truth; it does not define words and, by this very fact, reveals itself as diametrically opposed to such stringency of thought.

The "New Mass" is one of the productions of the Revolution, one of its tools of subversion, and the language of the "New Mass" is in the *genre* of the Revolution. Those who mean to assess the "New Mass" should not expect to find in it that clarity of thought and intention which one expects in the articulations of the sacred magisterium of the Church. They should not expect to find clear-cut affirmations or negations. They will find truth suggested—as well as many shades of its opposite. The only consistency they will find is the effort to confuse and to mislead, a refusal to debate fairly, but no *legally admissible evidence* of the conspiracy that is afoot. For this reason, the authors of the "New Mass" cannot be convicted of

heresy. An ordinary heretic boldly teaches his false belief, firmly denies traditional dogma, and, sometimes, is willing to die in defense of his contentions. The Revolutionary will seem to believe whatever it serves his immediate purpose to believe, will take any shape which pragmatic need dictates.

For this reason also, *the effort to decide the validity of the "New Mass"* (or, I suspect, *of any of the other new sacramental rites*) *through analysis of its language is doomed to failure*, for all the good it would do. The celebrant of the True Mass must intend to do what the Church intends. But how will you ever be able to guess the true intention of the Church when the formulation of its rites is now in the hands of men whose purpose is deliberately devious and indefinable, whose use of words and whose every act is compulsively nebulous and evasive? How will you ever prove the intentions of their ritual formulations when their own thinking is fluid, and basically nihilistic? Their intention is directly related to the condition of those whom their use of language is meant to influence. *Their language does not have objective intention, but dialectic direction*; their words are chosen always with a view to inching the thought of the masses into the direction of the Revolutionary negations; away, therefore, from objective truth and toward communism; away from supernatural verities, dogmas, and laws, and toward dialectical materialism, naturalism, cynicism, narcissism, and nihilism. This intention is behind the insatiable need to change the rites of the Church, to change the nomenclature, to change all the prayers, to abolish all the traditions, to ban the merely customary—without regard to any objective benefit or principle.

In their desire for some kind of definiteness and stability, people will concede almost anything if they think doctrine not in jeopardy, on the promise that the next change will be the last. Whereas, the Revolution, being indifferent to truth or

human feeling (but keenly aware of the usefulness of both), will promise anything, give every impression of sincerity, create as convincing a rationale as possible, and seem to compromise on its every chosen direction. Any change is progress, so long as no stage is final. Exploiting the poor memory, the ignorance, the guilelessness, and the indifference of those who will sacrifice anything to be free of further annoyance (who will surrender every principle in order not to be thought odd by the majority, i.e., the masses), the Revolution is certain that as soon as one change has been accepted, no matter how resentfully, it is time to agitate for another, being sure to ignore and put to silence all reminders of previous promises. With each change, its uncomprehending subjects stand at an ever greater distance from their point of departure, and remember it ever more vaguely, and think it ever less necessary. For a few moments' peace (which is never permitted, of course), they will allow themselves to be treated like curs.

With regard to the True Mass, once Catholics—Pope, clergy, and people—surrendered to the Revolutionary principle that the Mass needed to be adapted to modern times, and once the solemn *noli tangere* ("do not touch") of St. Pius V had been violated, the entire liturgy and the whole body of the Church (whose heart and heart-beat the liturgy is) became paralyzed and easy prey for the "arrangers." Since then, we have been surrendering on every front, on every point of doctrine and morality, even on the most basic principles of human life. The wall was breached; ever since, all has been inconsistency, disorder, foolishness, and subterfuge.

And, as the months pass, the erosion of the Faith continues. The hierarchy and the faithful, who vainly look to the Church for leadership, clear-sightedness, and direction, are now together in a state of heedless, mindless falling away. Only those who have clung to Catholic principles and kept

themselves aloof from the wearing propagandization can even perceive the decline. Indeed, the sun has lost its light! (Apoc. 9:2; Is. 13:10; Ez. 32:7).

Chapter Five

The Apostolic Constitution of Pope Paul VI, *Missale Romanum*

Here I can do no better than quote at some length the redoubtable Abbe Georges de Nantes, writing in the June, 1970, issue of his *The Catholic Counter-Reformation*. After this quotation, I will summarize the most important points in his disclosure.

> I have here under my eyes, the photocopies kindly supplied to a friend from the Bishop's House at Nancy (France), and guaranteed to conform to the originals by Chancellor Dautrey, on the date of 13th May, 1970, and under the seal of this bishopric.
>
> In this document, Pope Paul VI cites his reform of the Mass within the continuity of the liturgical restoration of Pius XII and presents the new *Ordo* as a "revision" and an "enrichment" of the Roman Missal; and also as a "new arrangement of texts and rites, in such a way that they express more clearly the holy things which they signify."

"The major innovation," according to his expression, is the introduction of new Canons (the Pope uses the word: *Statuimus*) which are presented as ancient, though they are in fact very modern; and the modification of the formula of Consecration itself, on the pretext of making them all identical: *Jussimus*… The term "*mysterium fidei*" is left out and placed within the context of an "acclamation", where it loses its original and full meaning. This rejection represents the work of very sinister influences.

The innovations which are referred to as minor, are concerned with simplification, suppression, or restoration of prayers and rites, the changing round of the order of readings, and the very considerable modifications of the liturgical calendar.

The Pope then makes his concluding remarks—but here we must make a distinction between the Latin text and its so-called French translation. [Translator's note—the relevant passages of the English text, as published in the English edition of *Oss. Rom*. 8th May, 1969, are identical with the French and have been used here.] The Latin text, the photocopy of the original text printed on the Vatican printing press and dated June, has two paragraphs here. The French text, photocopied from *Documentation Catholique*, in which it is quoted as a translation emanating from the Vatican Press Bureau, contains three, *the second of which is an invention pure and simple.* [Author's italics]. It does not exist in the Latin text, which alone is the authoritative one…

In the first paragraph of this conclusion of his discourse the Holy Father expresses his hope that the new Missal will be received by all as a sign and instrument of unity: "*confidimus*." It is through an unheard-of act of violence—abuse No. 1—that the "Press Bureau" (?) invented the false translation, which

I am now going to read out to you: "In conclusion, we wish to give the force of law to all that we have set forth concerning the new Roman Missal." This conclusion, with its formally legislative tone, is a fabrication, inserted in the place where the Pope had merely written, according to the faithful translation made by Abbe Dulac: "Concerning all that we have just set forth regarding the new Roman Missal, We are pleased here to end by drawing a conclusion." And this conclusion refers to the confidence that all will find again in this Missal their mutual unity. *Whoever has transformed this "confidence" into a "Law" has lied.* [Author's italics].

Having made such a good start, and while they were about it, they invented a second paragraph which does not exist at all in the original Latin text, as photocopied by your Bishop's House, which I have here under my eyes. [Again the English text is identical with the French—Translator's note.] Here then is the fraud: "We order that the prescriptions of this Constitution go into effect November 30th of this year, the first Sunday of Advent." *This is the essence of the text and it is a forgery.* [Author's italics].

The last paragraph, if you read it as the third in the French or Italian [or English] text, does indeed give the impression of wishing to impose an obligation even if the subject-matter, and the precise extent, of this obligation are left indeterminate. This is what it says: "We wish that these our decrees and prescriptions may be firm and effective now and in the future, notwithstanding, to the extent necessary, the apostolic constitutions and ordinances issued by our predecessors, and other prescriptions, even those deserving particular mention and derogation." Read in the context of the original Latin text, that is to say, freed from the encumbrance of the two forged texts

preceding it, these simple words cannot be placed in comparison with detailed instructions and concessions, firm, and intended to last in perpetuity. Here we have a simple statement of the wishes of Paul VI, a directive bereft of any indication that would imply a strict obligation, and one which is not accompanied by any threat of sanctions. The definite obligation of having to follow the new *Ordo*, which is supposedly contained in the Apostolic Constitution, springs therefore from two sentences, of which the one is an invention pure and simple and the other one contains a manifest mistranslation of the authentic text. *The forged text issued by the "Press Bureau" imposes an obligation: that is as much as to say that the true text imposes nothing of the kind. That was the thing to be proved! The Constitution* Missale Romanum*, in its authentic Latin text, does not impose an obligation*. Paul VI does not impose an obligation to follow his *Ordo Missae*!

However, a communication I received yesterday made me think that Msgr. Pirolley (the Bishop of Nancy), though himself deceived in the first place, has now been put on his guard. I have here a second photocopy, handed out from [the] Bishop's House to another member of the diocese, of the famous text of the Pope's which is obliging the whole world to follow his new Mass. Well–they had more sense this time and, with the help of paste and scissors, they have produced a photocopy, in both Latin and French, of the last of these paragraphs alone–the two preceding ones have disappeared! We may well quote La Rochefoucauld when he said that "hypocrisy was [sic] a compliment paid by vice to virtue." Here is [the] Bishop's House at Nancy tacitly acknowledging the crime committed in Rome! This is a memorable date indeed!

There is nothing that can validly annul the Bull of St. Pius V. Paul VI, in his Constitution, does not formally

> *abrogate it*, [Author's italics] and if he takes the risk, together with those who embrace his reform, of incurring the wrath of the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, we still have to admit that he is not obliging anyone to follow him into this peril. He does no more than to express a simple and indefinite wish, together with the hope that all may find spontaneously a common unity in the practice of the new reformed form of worship.[67]

I am aware that the above quotation is difficult reading. The information it contains, however, has more than just historic significance, so it must be shown as clearly as possible what the passage says.

On the 3rd of April, 1969, the Pope presented his "New Missal." The Apostolic Constitution, *Missale Romanum* is the text of the address he gave on that occasion. It has the same relationship to the "*Novus Ordo Missae*" as the *Quo Primum* has to St. Pius V's *Missale Romanum*. What I intend to do is first show the complete Latin text of the crucial conclusory paragraphs of the decree, then point out the sentence which was deliberately mistranslated, and finally indicate the fabricated insertion. You will see what remains of the "decree."

The following are the last three paragraphs as they appear in the Acta Apostolicae Sedis, which is the official organ of the Holy See:

> *Ad extremum, ex iis quae hactenus de novo Missali Romano exposuimus quiddam nunc cogere et efficere placet. Cum Decessor Noster S. Pius V principem* Missalis Romani *editionem promulgavit, illud veluti quoddam*

[67] *The Catholic Counter-Reformation in the XXth Century*. No. 5, June, 1970. R. P. Georges de Nantes, Editor. Maison Saint-Joseph-10 Saint-Patres-les-Vaudes, France. Pp. 9–10.

unitatis liturgicae instrumentum idemque tamquam genuini religiosique cultus in Ecclesia monumentum christiano populo representavit. Haud secus Nos, etsi, deprae scripto Concilii Vaticani II, in novum Missale legitimas varietates et aptationes ascivimus, nihilo tamen secus fore confidimus*, ut hoc ipsum a christifidelibus quasi subsidium ad mutuam omnium unitatem testandam confirmadamque accipiatur, utpote cuius ope, in tot varietate linguarum, una eademque cunctorum precatio ad caelestem Patrem, per summum Pontificem nostrum Jesum Christum, in Spiritu Sancto, quovis ture fragrantio ascendat.*

Quae Constitutione hac Nostra praescripsimus vigere incipient a die XXX proximi mensis Novembris hoc anno, id est a Dominica I Adventus.

Nostra haec autem statuta et praescripta nunc et in posterum firma et efficacia esse et fore volumnus, non obstantibus, quatenus opus sit, Constitutionibus et Ordinationibus Apostolicis a Dessoribus Nostris editis, ceterisque praescriptionibus Etiam peculiari mentione et derogatione dignis.

Datum etc...[68]

The first sentence of the above, "*Ad extremum…placet,"* was deliberately mistranslated. It was immediately sent around the world. When attention was called to the error, no effort at all was made to set things right. Here are the two renderings:

INCORRECT: In conclusion, we wish to give the force of law to all that was have set forth concerning the new Roman Missal.

[68] *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, 30 April 1969. Vol. 61, No. 4. pp. 221–22.

CORRECT: Concerning all that we have just set forth regarding the new Roman Missal, We are pleased here to end by drawing a conclusion.

Abbe de Nantes tells us that the middle paragraph, i.e., *"Quae Constitutione…Adventus,"* was not in the original text of the Pope's announcement. It was altogether made up and inserted by members of the "Vatican Press Bureau." These people (or this person, whoever) found the Pontiff's words a bit weak, and so tried to "firm them up" a bit. It goes without saying that the inserted words have no binding force whatsoever—except that the Holy Father himself made no move to have them deleted and proceeded ever after as if they were his own. Here is the forgery:

> We order that the prescriptions of this Constitution go into effect November 30th of this year [1969], the first Sunday of Lent.

Now, the final paragraph:

> We wish that these our decrees and prescriptions may be firm and effective now and in the future, notwithstanding, to the extent necessary, the apostolic constitutions and ordinances issued by our predecessors, and other prescriptions, even those deserving particular mention and derogation.

The *internal evidence* to support Abbe de Nantes' (and others') assertion is easy to see. In the inserted paragraph a specific date is given when the new "Missal" is to become official. But in the paragraph following it, which I quote below, the Pope says that his "decree" is to be considered "*firm and effective now and in the future*." But

he neither mentions nor indicates any date at all; whereas, above a *specific date* is given. This insertion obviously has no continuity with its context.

We have here, then, a clear case in which there is discovered the most perfidious and shameless chicanery in a matter in which nothing could be more sacred or important for the Church and the souls of the faithful, which, after it is brought to light, is ratified by the Pope (at least implicitly), enforced by the bishops, and completely ignored by the so-called theologians and scholars of the Church, not to mention the priests.

We are left with two sentences which contain the Pope's directive concerning the "*Novus Ordo*." One occurs in the first of the three paragraphs quoted above. It begins, *"Haud secus Nos…"* You will notice I emphasized the word, "*confidimus*," "We *hope*." The English is:

> While leaving room in the New Missal, according to the order of the Second Vatican Council, for legitimate variations and adaptations, *we hope* nevertheless that the Missal will be received by the faithful as an instrument which bears witness to and which affirms the common unity of all [etc].

The last paragraph has this translation. In it I have emphasized the word "*volumus*," "We *wish*":

> *We wish* that these our decrees and prescriptions may be firm and effective now and in the future, notwithstanding, to the extent necessary, the apostolic constitutions and ordinances issued by our predecessors, and other prescriptions, even those deserving particular mention and derogation.

The point I am making is that, when the text is purged of its forgery and given its correct translation, we find that the whole weight of the document, and the Act of abolishing the Mass and of introducing its deceptive Semblance, rests on two words "*confidimus*," "we hope", "we trust," "we have confidence that," "we wish, etc., and "*volumus*," "we wish," "we desire, "we would be pleased," etc. Two words of such thin-voiced wistfulness are supposed to effectively command, nay, *force* the whole Latin Church to forsake its most precious Treasure, *the* most essential means for our salvation, to completely forget over fifteen hundred years of tradition (figured *most* conservatively), to ignore the solemn promulgations, edicts, injunctions, instructions, and anathemas of most of the successors of the Great Fisherman, to bury in silence the rapturous prayers and encomia inspired by it in the Saints of the West, and, without question or hesitation, to begin the performance of a bureaucratic Composition, whose real meaning and purpose have been the subject of the most resentful criticism and telling attacks since it first saw the light of day. *This truly is what our enemies may well describe as "popery" in the authentic sense of the word! As if our religion were nothing more than the dumb and servile fulfillment of the Pope's mere wishes, totally unrelated to morality, Revelation, history, law, or even plain common sense!* If Satan could contrive a more effective way of exposing the lustrous Bride of Christ to ridicule and confusion, what could it possibly be?

One obvious question is: Why did His Holiness not speak in tones similar to those of St. Pius? Why did he not proceed in this fashion: Explain where the Tridentine Mass was deficient and then show how the "*Novus Ordo*" has merely corrected these deficiencies—without changing any of the essentials thereof? He might next have solemnly curtailed the use of the old *Missale Romanum*, joining to this curtailment his own

weighty anathemas to anyone who should do so thereafter. He might then have expounded in detail on the doctrinal "richness" of the "New Mass" by delineating clearly the Catholic Truth of its prayers and the reverence of its rites. Then he might have issued a solemn and unmistakable decretal, on the one hand, reasserting the agelessness and unalterableness of the dogmatic truths of Trent, which the "*Novus Ordo*" supposedly expresses so clearly, while, on the other, commanding all the clergy of the Roman Rite, "Cardinals not excluded," as of a certain date, to accept it and adhere to it minutely, under pain of most serious sin, lest they incur "The wrath of Almighty God and the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul!" Why–it is a perfectly valid question–was this not done? Why instead does the Pontiff, in presenting the world with a "New Mass," not explain how it has been possible to produce something even superior to that Mass of which Pope Urban VIII wrote:

> If there is anything divine among the possessions of men, which the citizens of Heaven might covet (were covetousness possible for them), it would certainly be the most Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, whose blessing is such that in it men possess a certain anticipation of Heaven while still on earth. How greatly must mortals strive that this most awesome privilege be guarded with due cult and reverence, and take care lest their negligence offend the eyes of the angels, who watch with envious adoration.[69]

Indeed, in speechless disbelief, one cannot help observing that Pope Paul's *Missale Romanum* is as different from Pope St.

[69] Apostolic Constitution *Si Quid Est* of Pope Urban VIII from *Missale Romanum*. Desclee & Socii.

Pius's *Quo Primum* as are the two things they bestow on the Church. One can only comment, "For obvious reasons!"

Let us once more read the *authentic text* of his proclamation as I have quoted it above. Does it not seem as if our Holy Father were almost painfully aware that the eyes of all Christendom (and uncounted generations yet to be born) are upon him and will ever after remember his taking this reckless step? Does it not seem he cannot bring himself to do it with that *spirit* which befits so tremendous an Act? Notice how glancingly he accomplishes his dreadful task of voiding (if that were possible) the acts of literally generations of popes:

> . . .notwithstanding, to the extent necessary, the apostolic constitutions and ordinances issued by our predecessors, and other prescriptions, even those *deserving* particular mention and derogation. [Author's Italics][70]

You see, Pope Paul admits that the ordinances of his Predecessors *deserve* to be explained away. One which deserves "particular mention and derogation" is St. Pius V's *Quo Primum,* of course. Is it for want of courage or for want of reasons that he does not do so? Surely it is not for want of *time*.

Ever since the issuance of Pope Paul's *Missale Romanum*, even after the disclosure of foul play in its translation and publication, *which, needless to say, without reference to anything else, renders it indefensible and unenforcible, and therefore completely null and void*. Pope Paul himself has proceeded, not as if he had imposed a law, but only as if he had asked his people to accept his "New Mass" and had been surprised and saddened by the resulting outcry. Never has he invoked his

[70] Appendix II, Par. 15

own "decree" as if it were an irrevocable law; he seems barely to refer to it.

In view of all that has been said, it would seem unnecessary to prove that Pope Paul's "decree" *Missale Romanum* cannot, in any sense of the word, be considered a valid and binding law. However, it may be of some use to present the matter a bit more academically. I will, therefore, list the requisites for the imposition of a law and show wherein Pope Paul's is deficient:

1. *Concerning the object of the law:* The legislator must have province over the matters in question. The pope, and the pope alone, may legislate on liturgical matters in the Church. Not even he, however, may change the form of the sacrament of the Eucharist.[71] His attempt to do so in the "*Novus Ordo*" renders his "decree" *Missale Romanum* null and void. Further, and much more important, the pope does have supreme jurisdiction over all religious matters, but he may not command anyone to sin. Due to its intrinsic heterodoxy, the "New Mass" is not only a denial of many of the doctrines of the Faith, but it is also an act of sacrilege. This is the main cause for the complete nullity of this present law.

2. *Concerning the subjects of the law:* The legislator must have jurisdiction over those who would be bound by the law and indicate in the law itself to whom it applies. There is in this "decree" no indication as to who is bound to obey it.

3. *Concerning the relationship of the new law with the old laws:* The legislator must have the right to abrogate previously existing laws which are contrary to the law he wishes to pass. He must officially abrogate these laws before he can impose his own. Pope Paul has not abrogated the decree of Pope St. Pius V's *Quo Primum*, nor any other laws which concern the True Mass. In his "decree," *Missale Romanum*, he speaks thusly:

[71] Cf. "Has the Church the Right." P. H. Omlor, Athanasius Press, Reno, Nevada, 1969.

"notwithstanding, to the extent necessary, the apostolic constitutions and ordinances issued by our predecessors, and other prescriptions, even those deserving particular mention and derogation." Nothing here clearly indicates that all previous liturgical laws will no longer be in effect.

4. *Concerning the language of the law:* The legislator must impose the law *as law*. That is, the language used must make it clear that a law is being imposed. As we have just seen, the words used by the Pope concerning the acceptance of the "New Mass" are "*volumus*" and "*confidimus*," both of which verbs can be translated as "we wish." These words can in no way be understood to impose a law.

5. *Concerning the time of the effectiveness of the law:* The legislator must indicate when the law will go into effect. As we have seen, the sentence in the "decree," *Missale Romanum*, which contains a specific date is a forgery. The "decree" itself assigns no date for the acceptance of the "New Mass."

6. *Concerning the enforcement of the law:* The legislator must indicate what penalties will be incurred by those who break the law. No such penalties are indicated in the "decree" of Pope Paul.

As can easily be seen, *in the issuance of the "law" which introduced the "New Mass," NONE of the requisites for the promulgation of a valid law was fulfilled!* Indeed, so patently and so completely null is this decree that it is surprising someone has not brought it forth as evidence that Pope Paul is a prisoner in the Vatican, trying through the issuance of such a preposterous proclamation to signal to the outside world that he is not a free agent and that no one should take it seriously. How I would that this proof could be found! To the very best of my knowledge, there is no chance of such a discovery being made.

Consequently, the bishops, who seemed to have been in a fog since they left to attend the Second Vatican Council, have no power whatsoever to enforce the "decree." And they have had much too little difficulty doing so, because of the misguided docility and poor theology of their clergy. Where any priest has refused to accept the "New Mass," his superiors have found themselves in a terrible quandary. They have deemed it necessary to make some kind of "arrangement;" usually they have confined the non-conformist to saying Holy Mass privately.

Thus, the whole thing reveals itself with a glare. The priest is not censured, nor excommunicated for heresy, nor suspended for disobedience, which would seem logical. To the extent the "arrangement" can be made to look respectable, the priest is given an assignment which takes into consideration his "condition;" he remains in "good standing", is allowed to minister to the people according to the other laws of the Church and his own conscience, and is treated most kindly (generally). It is as if he were *convalescing* from something, while the deeply concerned doctors keep consulting for a cure. But, one thing is necessary: he must be withdrawn from the public view when he offers the "pestiferious Mass"—to use Luther's phrase. Thus this priest becomes, like a martyr, the most fortunate of all his confreres; he is granted the inestimable privilege, which has become so rare, of offering the True Mass. The Priest, suddenly and unexpectedly, and beyond all his deserts, finds himself rejoicing that he has been "accounted worthy to suffer reproach for the name of Jesus" (Acts 5:41)!

Obviously, then, as Abbe de Nantes has commented, it is not such a priest who is guilty of anything; it is the True Mass (and the people, no doubt, for wanting it back)! The True Mass is being "quarantined," as something vile, dangerous, and catching. It must be suppressed, gotten out of sight, that the

people may forget it, that they may stop clamoring for it—the ignorant unwashed "that knoweth not the Law" (Jn. 7:49). They are revisionist!

The bishops (many of whom continue to say the "Old Mass" in their private chapels, for reasons of devotion, no doubt) feel so comfortable with their trusty, old *Missale* ("illegal" as such a thing is), thus find themselves caught in the middle. They live in terror, lest one of their Revolutionary priests will succeed in maneuvering them into an incident which might get back to Rome. At the same time, they find themselves naked before the ubiquitous, noisome knot of diehards among their flocks, who fixedly behold them in open and stolid opposition to centuries of Tradition (toward which they could not bow often and deeply enough at the Second Vatican Council). They open their *Missales* to run head-on into St. Pius V, Clement VII, Urban VIII, St. Pius X, Benedict XV, and John XXIII, the letters of whose editions of the *Missale* they must page through each time they wish to use it and whom they now publicly disown. They turn the pages to the names of one magnificent saint after another, who became such, by their own admission, through the Holy Mass, but whose virtue has become too irrelevant to celebrate anymore–it must be "*memorialized*."

Chapter Six

The Burden

And Elias coming to all the people, said: How long do you halt between two sides? If the Lord be God, follow him; but if Baal, then follow him.

3 Kings 18:21

Anyone should be able to perceive that the days of the "New Mass" are numbered. It is only a matter of time before the Church will reject this indigestible "Meal," and return to the "Sacred Banquet in which Christ is consumed, the memory of His Passion is celebrated, the soul is filled with grace and given a pledge of future glory."[72]

The restoration will come, but this says nothing of the fate of present-day conformists, those middle-of-the-roaders, who refuse to see that they are exactly where their seducers have planned for them to be. The abandonment of the True Mass is an act of highest infidelity; participation in the "New Mass" (in any form, in any language) is complicity in the Great Sacrilege. Those who either "say" it or attend it are helping to prolong its life, are effectively denying their Faith, and are exposing themselves and those in their charge to its satanic influence.

All must admit that insofar as they have accepted the "New Mass," they have allowed themselves to be "processed" into

[72] *O Sacrum Convivium*, Magnificat Antiphon from the Second Vespers of the Feast of Corpus Christi. Roman Breviary.

identifying the True Faith with the humanistic pantheism of the Revolution. While granting almost divine honors to Pope Paul VI, we came to regard the Holy Mass as nothing more than a human fabrication, a mere Masonic exercise. Thinking our superiors would never *dream* of doing, in its regard, anything but what was good, necessary, and permissible, we stood by and watched them make a Joke of it, to the delight of those who hate it more than we love it. Thus, we ourselves have now grown used to their impious familiarity, their priggish presumptuousness, and their rough-shod iconoclasm. This could only mean that we must have lost something of our former reverence and devotion for the True Mass. We accepted as true what they taught us: that the Mass is *no more than*, and *whatever*, and *only*, what they made it; and no more than the enemies of Christ and of His ineffable Sacrifice always said it was. Before anything else, therefore, we must recall ourselves to our former awareness, meditate on its infinite grandeur and utter irreplaceability, and pray for the grace to esteem and honor it worthily. Only if we do this shall we be able to rise to the occasion of our present crisis and assume that burden which our noble Faith imposes upon us.

We can and we must pray that Pope Paul will himself retract his "wishes" and put an end to the present malaise. However, it would be unrealistic to expect him to, and we certainly may not wait for such a conversion. It would be utter folly to expect that our bishops will begin to act like successors of the Apostles. This is no place to speak of them at length. As a group, *they obviously do not know their theology*. If they do, they give no promise of letting anyone else find out about it. Since at least the Second Vatican Council, they have, with only a few exceptions, shown themselves shallow, craven, irrelevant, and totally incapable of reading their times. For years now, we have waited for them to stand up to the Pope as St. Paul would

(Gal. 2:11), and as we have a right to expect them to. Amid the confusion and deterioration of the Faith and the runaway liberalization of all discipline which has emanated from the Vatican, their dominant concern seems to have been *survival* —and let the devil take the hindmost!

A. Priests

> Moreover, I maintain and profess, without doubting, all the other teachings handed down, defined, and declared in the sacred canons by the ecumenical councils, especially by the most holy Council of Trent and by the [First] Ecumenical Vatican Council, particularly that of the primacy and the infallible magisterium of the Roman pontiff; and at the same time I condemn, reject, and abominate all opinions to the contrary and all heresies whatever which the Church condemns, rejects, and anathematizes.
>
> I, N…, promise, vow, and swear that, with God's help, I shall most constantly hold and profess this true Catholic faith, outside of which no one can be saved and which I now freely profess and truly hold. With the help of God, I shall profess it whole and unblemished to my dying breath; and, to the best of my ability, I shall see to it that my subjects and those entrusted to me by virtue of my office hold it, teach it, and preach it. So help me God and His holy Gospels.[73]

The foregoing comes from the Oath known as "The Profession of Faith," which all priests are required by the Code of Canon Law to take both before and after their Ordination. Who would not say that it is highly providential that this Oath makes specific mention of the decrees of the Council of Trent

[73] Appendix III

(which defined the doctrines of the Mass) and the First Vatican Council (which defined the doctrine of papal infallibility)?

The "Profession" concerns Catholic doctrinal belief. It is made regardless of all earthly authority. It is made directly to God, before the Tabernacle of the King of kings. Nothing could possibly happen to make its tenets untrue, hence, no priest, be he pope or simple curate, could be dispensed from it. It seems that most priests have been so affected by the "spirit of renewal" (read: "Revolution"), that they feel no obligation at all to this commitment. In a way, therefore, they are no different from some of their confreres who have abandoned their priestly ministry altogether; that is, they do what they are allowed to do instead of what they promised.

The Oath is unconditional. The Church is "in command." No one *has* to take it; but one must take it if he is going to enter the priesthood or, having entered, ascend to a higher office and dignity. The Code of Canon Law requires that it be taken before the reception of the subdiaconate. After ordination it must be reiterated before faculties are granted for preaching, teaching, or hearing confessions. It is required again when one receives a pastorate or professorship in a Catholic college or seminary where one intends to teach philosophy or theology. It must be renewed by a bishop-elect and a cardinal-elect and by him who accedes to the papal throne.

Since those who have a higher rank in the Church must have taken this Oath more frequently, it must be a graver thing for prelates to violate it than for those "down in the ranks." One feels inclined to say that the former are more strongly bound by it for that reason, if such were possible.

One thing is certain, the Oath is absolute; it is strictly worded—clearly, and uncompromisingly. There can be no excuse for a cleric not knowing what it says or what it means. There is nothing in it which suggests its terms are alterable or

dispensable. No reason—even a direct command from the Supreme Pontiff—is conceived for its future retraction.

No great imagination is required to appreciate how much strength the Church has derived from such a commitment on the part of each of its priests, when each of them adhered to this Oath literally and fearlessly. No wonder the Revolutionists who now infest the Church had to begin the process of emasculating and eventually discarding the Oath. You may remember a few years ago they began by abbreviating its companion, The Oath Against Modernism. You can be sure it was only the first shot! And no wonder that, while the cry of obedience to the Pope is being dinned into our ears, mention of this Oath is regarded as a most impolite digression.

Every priest takes the Oath individually. What a grand and bold affirmation it is, and how gladly and proudly we uttered it! In that day, we were ready for the sword or the lions! (Bring them on!) The faithful are bound to wonder whether their priests would (or should I say, *could*) *bring themselves* to repeat the ceremony now, in view of recent events, using the very same words they used in the adventurous days of their subdiaconate. Would they, or do they now, have some reservations? Would they now, at least internally, attach certain conditions?

Most priests, if they were honest (in a simple, child-like way —not in an "adult" way), would admit they have excused themselves from the literal terms of their priestly Oath. This is a nice way of saying they have perjured themselves through their acceptance of the "New Mass," whose very existence is a clear and inarguable violation of the Canons of the Council of Trent. To have accepted the "faith" represented by the "*Novus Ordo*" is to have abandoned that of Trent and to have apostatized from it. And every time they follow the "New

Order," they are renewing that original forswearal (a less abrasive word than "lie").

Such priests exist, therefore, in a condition very similar to those who live in adulterous marriages, only worse. Adulterers live in sin and compound their guilt with every act of intercourse. Those priests, however, add the dimension of sacrilege to their perjury when they parody the Mass.

Well did the prophet Ezechiel say of them:

> *Her priests have despised my law, and have defiled my sanctuaries, they have put no difference between holy and profane; nor have distinguished between the polluted and the clean; and they have turned away their eyes from my Sabbaths, and I was profound in the midst of them.*
>
> Ezechiel 22:26

Therefore, the dilemma for priests nowadays is more compelling than they wish to admit: Either they must acknowledge they do not believe any longer the tenets of the Council of Trent and *do* subscribe to the "New Religion," with its worship of man, or they are falsely performing the rites of the "New Religion," while secretly holding to the "Old Faith." In their present predicament, they will have to decide which is the greater sin, as well as which sin they choose to be damned for—I really should say "sins," because, as you can see, their acts have many dimensions.

For the present, it looks as if most of them will continue to convince themselves that the "New Mass" is the "Old Mass," that the "New Religion" is the True Religion, that there is no *essential* difference between what was and what is. All the while, they will keep their eyes peeled for a "break" in the situation, keep a careful count of the months before their retirement, when they will say the "Tridentine Mass" privately, just to be on the safe side! They

will also keep up a lively interest in the question of whether Pope Paul VI will retire: there is *some* hope in that quarter!

During the interim, they will keep telling themselves they are doing the prudent thing, rendering the greatest service to the people, maintaining the peace, keeping things going, saying their prayers, trying to make the "New Liturgy" as respectable looking as possible! They will scrupulously avoid consulting their theology texts and the "pre-Conciliar" papal writings. The Council made all those *obsolete*, you understand. They will find themselves treating, as some kind of malevolent strangers, those few daring, single-minded people (for it takes daring), who accost them with bland and blunt questions, which need highly-technical theological training to understand the answers to. You know: "But, Father, how can you justify…?"; "But it says right here in this book…!" etc. Having become accessory to the negation of all traditional belief and authority, they will perforce run to hide behind the skirts of their "Revolutionary 'mother church,'" which can dispense them from anything and everything.

They do not want to see it or to be reminded of it, but the fact remains: these "middle-of-the-road" padres, these many-hued ministers of the "New Establishment," have become a new-born generation of T. S. Eliot's "hollow men," and "men of straw." They are the compliant "yes men" which the Revolution produces and finds so useful. And they work so hard, preoccupying their minds, drowning out their consciences. Watching them, one cannot help recalling Orwell's work-horses in *Animal Farm*. As Father Fahey wrote: "Profanation of the Blessed Eucharist has, on many occasions at least, been part of the preparation of apostate Catholics to be fitting instruments of revolution."[74]

[74] *The Kingship of Christ and Organized Naturalism*. Rev. Denis Fahey, C.S.Sp. Regina Publications. Dublin. p. unknown.

They pretend such great independence and voluntarity and such strong belief, all as if nothing untoward were happening in the whole wide world. On "safe" subjects, they are veritable titans of Orthodoxy and principle. (Grrrr!)

They are such dutiful and honorable and obedient men, not because they are servants of Christ, but because they are insecure, nervous, and unhappy. They used to be leaders, men of discipline, a force to be reckoned with. (The atheist Nietsche warned his followers to keep a safe distance from them.) Now they are has-beens, relics, and cast-offs. They are without purpose, without dedication; there is a thorn in their side, a pebble in their shoe, and a scar across their eyes. All their answers are circuitous; they wish to change the subject. "But if the salt lose its savor, wherewith shall it be salted? It is good for nothing anymore but to be cast out, and to be trodden on by men" (Mt. 5:13).

If they were honest, they would at least consider seriously the contentions made in these pages; *they* should have made them long before now. There is no excuse for this. Either such men should never have been ordained, or they are using their priesthood as a benefice. However, the reason these priests have not given the matter any thought is that those of their confreres who are *customarily* more alert to matters theological, and their bishops, have played the coward and not dared to raise the question for them to consider. A perusal of periodicals written for priests during the past few years is a perfect example. The "New Mass" is usually treated in the "question-and-answer" columns. I need not describe the pettifoggery one encounters there.

The conclusions I have come to here do, of course, seem extreme. The reason, however, is not that my conclusions are inaccurate, but because most priests have ceased to mean what they say. Is it too much to expect that they give sound reasons

why they consider themselves no longer bound by their priestly oaths? Do not the people have a right to some sort of explanation? Since when is any Catholic—priest or layman—not supposed to have a good reason for everything he does? *Indeed, here is the momentous glaring discrepancy in the whole "renewal" argument and effort: there are no adequate reasons for any of it!* None of all its adherents seem to be able to deal with these questions according to the rules of honest argumentation. Their pusillanimous invocation of the Pope is well calculated to make our Religion what our worst enemies have always said it was, even though *our enemies* knew better. Their efforts to justify the insufferable "New Mass" amount to one argument: *"The Pope said to!"* And this is the Faith without which there can be no salvation. Imagine!

All priests—cardinals not excluded—must return to the True Mass immediately. This obviously involves two steps—if they do not do the second, they still must do the first:

(1) They must stop "saying" the "New Mass." They must completely separate themselves from it and the churches where it *is* "said"—or separate the "New Mass" from the churches in their care. They must desist doing anything to compromise themselves in this regard. *To "say" the "New Mass" is an act of sacrilege and desecration*.

(2) They must begin to say the True Mass with total disregard for any earthly consequences, whenever and wherever this can be done, but only in accord with the Code of Canon Law. How they manage it is their affair; they are of age, strong, brave, and consecrated men. They will be surprised at how God will provide for them. Even should they have to suffer great hardships, these will serve as partial reparation for their previous disloyalty and infidelity, as well as the first installments on that great expiation which the whole Church must, in time, surely make for the Great Sacrilege. Let them be

reminded that Pope St. Pius V, in *Quo Primum*, envisioned that penalties might someday be threatened against those who adhered to his command. *No matter what sufferings their act costs them, none are so cruel as those the Revolution has in store for them once it is through with them!* They must proceed to offer the True Mass for as many of the faithful as they can get to attend it, as often as is possible and canonically permissible. They will find, in this apostolate, enough.

I need to add that a priest does not have to agree with all my contentions concerning the "New Mass" to be bound to the "Traditional Mass;" he is so bound by his Oath, independently of all other considerations.

Let priests take their example from those six thousand priests of Spain who, in a body, swore they would never accept the "New Mass."[75] Many questions suggest themselves by this heroic act, none of which, by the way, clerical periodicals have dared to raise. The only question I have is, "Where are the Americans?"

B. The People

Now, it is my grave obligation to act as a pastor and confessor and say what lay Catholics must do in view of what we have found the "*Novus Ordo*" to be. With the deliberate intention of preparing the reader, I have already mentioned these obligations in passing; now I must spell them out in detail. I emphasize again, that Catholics will be able to realize the truth of what I am saying only if they have grasped the terrible fact of the Great Sacrilege. No doubt, even after this belabored exposé, many will be tempted to describe as extremism that which follows, and upon their finding

[75] *Itineraires*, March, 1970.

themselves completely circumscribed, as they will, they may tend to imagine their plight as somehow of my doing.

Let them recall, once again, that the first and principal purpose of the Holy Mass is the adoration of the Most Blessed Trinity. This purpose precedes and dominates all other considerations, including our own salvation. Many will wish to circumvent the conclusions of this book, not because insufficient evidence has been adduced, but because the innate falsity and wickedness in the "New Mass" impose upon them what seem to be excessively strict obligations. Let them look for excuses and subterfuges to their heart's content. We can tell them in advance that their efforts will avail nothing. Woe to them if they are not honest about it!

While they are searching, they will need to keep two principles in mind. First, unless a person is completely certain that I am wrong concerning what the "New Mass" is and what it is not, he may not attend it. In other words, unless he can explain away the countless incongruities, the doctrinal faultiness, and the calculated deceitfulness of this unspeakable Harlequinade, as well as supply an ecclesiastical, legal reason for its very existence, unless he can produce a valid argument for the "New Mass," which the Pope of Rome himself has not done to this very date, he is strictly bound to stay away from it altogether.

The Church *forbids* us to act under doubt, where a question of morality or liceity exists, in a case where the Mass or the sacraments are concerned. In a word, one is bound in conscience to choose the safer course.

Moreover, the first inclination many people will have, due to the disturbance which these facts cause them, will be to rush to their nearest priest, that he might console them, quiet their scruples, and airily brush aside this whole matter. Such people will do so at their own risk. The idea of taking this book to

their priests is not only a good one, it is a necessary one. But let them not allow any priest to discount these many pages with a sentence or two. *If he is able to refute my arguments, by all means let him!* This writer will be as much in his debt as anyone. But the main theses of this book cannot be refuted with a few off-handed, facetious remarks or some stammering double-talk—if they can be refuted at all, which I defy anyone to attempt. He who allows himself to be so easily placated need not make plans to blame the priests for his own damnation.

Now, therefore, after we have busied ourselves casting such generous blame on the clergy, from the Sovereign Pontiff to the most unsuspecting and well-meaning curate, we get to the part where we see who among us has the right to throw any stones at others. As the excellent Father Lawrence Brey has written,

> This matter [of the Holy Mass] may well be the final test of orthodoxy, the *auto de fe* of the latter times, which will differentiate the true remnant Church and its faithful from the growing body of apostates who have affiliated themselves with the new religion of the Beast.[76]

The True Mass has truly become the "*auto de fe*." Every Catholic can know, with certainty, whether he stands with Christ or against Him. The line is clearly drawn. "He that can take, let him take it" (Matt. 19:12). No one is free to be indifferent or non-committal, or to feign uninvolvement. There is no middle ground to flee to. The "New Religion" is no religion at all, but the beguiling Siren-song of the terrible and unappeasable Revolution; and the "New Mass" is its malicious ploy, its official, brazen affront to God the All-Blessed, and to Jesus Christ, the God-Man. To accept either

[76] *The Final Test of Orthodoxy* Rev. Lawrence Brey, *Pro Multis*. No. 1, Box 276, Palos Park, Ill.

the "New Religion" or the "New Mass" is to assent to both; it is an act of rejection of the True Faith, without which one cannot be saved. Attendance at the "New Mass" is a positive act of infidelity, a sin against the First Commandment, against the virtue of religion, and a violation of all the laws of the Church which have to do with the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. In a word, attendance at the "New Mass" is a mortal sin. This statement is strong enough, but not the whole story. The following principles derive from it:

1. *It is wrong to receive Holy Communion at such "masses," or to receive "hosts" which have been "consecrated" at them.* The same principle applies whether one is well or sick, or even in danger of death. It should be understood that the main issue here is not whether these "hosts" are validly consecrated, but whether they come from the sacrilegious "New Mass."

2. *All churches where the "New Mass" is "celebrated" must be regarded as desecrated sanctuaries*, in that "impious and sordid actions" have been committed there (Canon 1172, Par. 1.3). Therefore, the True Mass should not be offered in them, nor should anyone attend the True Mass offered in them. Further, other services which are held in such churches must be avoided, if they have any connection with the "celebration" of the "New Mass." These include Benediction, Confirmations, marriages, funerals, etc. It would seem that the only acceptable reasons one might have for entering these churches at all is to attend a Baptism or go to Confession. At this statement, some may find themselves bestirred as they have not been from the beginning of this writing until now. They will say: "Now, this is too much! We may not even attend weddings and funerals in our own churches? Why, we have always been allowed to go to Protestant churches for such occasions!" My answer is: Eureka! Now you are catching on! It *is* permissible to go to Protestant churches for social

reasons. Services, no matter how greatly they differ from the Catholic liturgy, or how greatly they resemble it, and no matter how dissident their doctrine, are not to be regarded as irreverent Mimicries of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. Of set purpose, Protestant services *are not* and *explicitly claim not to be* the Eternal Sacrifice of the Mass. Perhaps before we are finished here, the meaning of the Revolution will have become clearer. For, truly, this is our situation: Through the "New Mass," those who treasure the Faith and who fear God have been virtually excluded from their own places of worship, just as Christ Himself, His Mother, and the angels and saints have been rudely cast out. Surely we should not be surprised. Did not our Divine Redeemer warn us: "The servant is not greater than his master. If they have persecuted Me, they will also persecute you" (Jn. 15:20).

3. *For the protection of one's orthodoxy, it is necessary to have nothing to do with the perjured ministers of the "New Religion" who prefer being "presidents" to being priests*. It is obvious they cannot be trusted. They have compromised their priesthood, their honor, and their faith for a little security. They are like walking dead men—disease-bearers. They will tell anyone anything to be allowed to remain on the "inside," to be assured of a place to stay, and to be thought obedient. Particularly, these parasitic pariahs must not be allowed to influence our children. It is difficult enough to rear children these days without having all one's efforts ruined by the likes of them.

4. *There is no reason in the world why one should feel obliged to continue to give money to support the "New Church."* In fact, it is morally wrong to do so. For it benefits the enemies of Christ, contributes to the strengthening of their hold on the Church, and helps them perpetuate their tyranny. I can think of one thing more foolish than the foregoing: that is to continue to ask these "presidents" to "say" "mass" for one's intentions.

Rather, if you have mistakenly given stipends for this purpose, ask for them back.

5. *Children should be removed immediately from those parish schools whose churches permit the "New Mass," no matter how "decently" it is "said"*. These are literally "schools of scandal" where the doctrines of the Revolution are systematically inculcated into their minds. Some will say: "But Catholic schools are better than public schools." In this respect—which takes precedence over all others—they are not. For all their corruption, no state schools (yet) have pseudo-religious ceremonies in which the Mass is buffooned. If one had his child in a state-owned school in which the Catholic Mass was travestied as a matter of daily schedule, would he not be bound to take his child from such a place, even at the risk of going to prison? We are in the midst of the Revolution. For this reason, parents should not be surprised to find their own schools forbidden to them.

Some will say: "It is not my responsibility to decide about the Mass; it is the priests' and the bishops' and the Pope's. If they do not provide the Mass, they will have to suffer for it." Such talk bespeaks a jaded spirit and is very common among lukewarm Catholics. This is a Protestant attitude. It bases everything on the avoidance of sin and the achieving of salvation. Our religion has a higher motivation. The main concern of this writing is not "who is guilty and who is going to pay," but the proper adoration of God and the defense of His honor. God knows well the clergy will suffer for their great betrayal and their niggardly cowardice. We can only pray that our beloved Lord will have mercy on them, so that they may turn and make amends before it is too late. It seems safe to say, they will be converted as soon as the people require it of them and prove themselves worthy of the Mass, so painlessly relinquished. But the answer to the objection given above is

that, if the clergy provide a sacrilege instead of a Mass, the faithful may not substitute the one for the other—fulfilling their obligation of worshipping Almighty God by insulting Him—just because that is what is scheduled for Sunday. *If the father hand his son a stone instead of a loaf, is the son going to eat it?* (Mt. 7:9).

Some may say: "I would have discontinued going to the "New Mass" long ago if it were not for the children. How am I going to teach the children to go to church unless I take them?" This is neat logic. You have no food for your children, so, in order that they may not forget how to eat, you will give them poison! It is this kind of warped reasoning which has prepared us all for our present plight. Instead of facing up to the fact that we are in the very midst of the Revolution, these people would hand their children over to the ravagers, almost out of spite. They will submit their children to be scandalized so that those priests, whose responsibility it is to instruct them, will come to deserve their damnation! Such an attitude is reminiscent of the harlot who, after having lost her own child, wished King Solomon to slice her neighbor's child in two (3 Kngs. 3:24–25). Let such unworthy, lazy parents as this be assured they will have a warm, cozy bed waiting for them in Hell. It should not have to be said, but I want to be sure to say it: This kind of talk treats children as if they were no more than dumb animals. Would it ever occur to such parents to *tell* their children, with truth and proper earnestness, of the times they live in, to prepare them for even greater tests of their faith, and to arm them with the sword of the Spirit, lest when the challenge comes, their children be incapable even of recognizing its demands, much less fulfilling them? What do parents think their counterparts must do in countries where communism has shown its full power and hatefulness?

Some may wish to accuse me of commanding the faithful to leave the Catholic Church. By no means. The point being made here is that Catholics have no choice but to withdraw from the pernicious Burlesque called the "New Mass" and to keep themselves clear of the sin and scandal involved in having any part in it. The obvious implication is that the people must demand that this hideous Distortion be cleansed from the House of God; they must turn out the "priests of Baal'" and they must arrange for Masses of reparation to be offered—immediately is not soon enough. The faithful must demand Catholic bishops for their dioceses, Catholic priests for their parishes, and Catholic teachers for their schools. If the people do not bring such a restoration about, let them not be surprised if God does it directly. But if they wait for God to do it, let them expect that He will count them party to the Crime, for so, as of now, most of them are. Surely, there is no need to remind anyone that the wrath of God is terrible indeed; only a fool would provoke it upon himself.

Below I will say what must be done by those who recognize the correctness of the preceding onerous injunctions and who determine that they have no choice but to obey them. But first, I must offer a word of advice to those of you who think serving with Christ's ragtag remnant will be too strong for your blood, or too ignominious. You have, of course, two other choices. I urge you to come to a decision as quickly as possible for your own peace of mind. You can either give up your religion altogether (as many have done), in a spirit of small-souled indignation and disloyalty, since it is, after all, unreasonable to expect you to do more for the Church now than you ever have or ever intended. Or, you can go along with the "New Religion," yield to the subversion of your own faith and that of others, thus helping the cause of "peace," and continue "dutifully" to attend the "New Mass," thus adding your voice

to the communal blasphemy of the Divine Majesty and the Holy Mass. (You really would be missed if you were not there, you know.) I say again: make a decision. And should you thus decide to surrender without a struggle, because this is surely the easiest and most "respectable" approach to your problem, I have further advice to give. By all means, do not merely surrender. Rather, join the Revolution, throw yourself into the effort, and dedicate yourself to its total program. Be either hot or cold in this present contest. Either take the side of the true Church, or take the side of those who intend to destroy it. In other words, play the game, win or lose. I so advise you because this is the way Our Lord would advise you, He finding sluggishness and mediocrity and neutrality more contemptible than open hatred and hostility (Apoc. 3:16).

If you do decide to continue in your new-found allegiance, I urge you to make the most of it. If you are going to abandon your faith, well then, what are you afraid of? Cast off all your "medieval moral inhibitions" and enjoy being "free." You are living as if the old rules still bound you, while you participate in the "rites" of your "liberation." Does that make sense? Look at all your brothers and sisters (look at the *nuns*); you see *they* have caught the spirit. If you must pay the bills for the "New religion," you might as well get something out of it. I say again, jump in with both feet, do not look back, and "live it up!" In this way, you will have no complaints or regrets ever after, nor feel cheated when it is all over. Enjoy the Revolution's current ascendancy and thrilling high ride. Enjoy the euphoria of living on extravagant promises and utopian dreams. Eat, drink, and be merry while you revel in the exciting anticipations of the coming New Age.

But whatever you do, do not be silly enough to imagine that there is anything in all the promises for you *personally*, either on this earth or in the life to come. That would be to

miss the point altogether. Whether you are one of the enthusiastic soldiers of the Revolution or just one of its harmless serialized slaves, you must understand that *the Revolution promises you nothing*. You have never heard it promise you virtue, nor union with God, nor final repentance, nor heavenly beatitude. In return for your renunciation of Catholicism and of your own person, the Revolution promises you only *a Cause, and the final exaltation of the Community*. This is what the Revolution says, and this is what it means. In this respect, at least, it is honest. I tell you these things, that when finally the Church revives, and with one mighty play, scores a great victory, you will not have missed *your* part of the fun.

Now for those of you who are still with me, who will dare to stand with Mary, the Sorrowful Mother, at the foot of Christ's Cross, I have these further instructions. You are wondering, I know, about your obligation to attend Holy Mass. Well, you must do all in your power to attend the True Mass as often as possible. There can be no sin in being unable to get to one, though it is understandable that greater effort must be put forth during these days than formerly, "For this is a very evil time" (Mich. 2:3). You must band together, obtain places which can be made to serve for chapels, and have priests come to offer the Holy Sacrifice—provided, I must emphasize, all things are done in accordance with the Code of Canon Law and with suitable decorum. Faithful priests and faithful people must find each other.

The principal intentions of these Masses should be the following:

1. Reparation for the countless acts of sacrilege being committed against the freshly crucified Son of God, Our Lord Jesus Christ.

2. The earnest petition for the conversion of the presently-reigning [1971] Supreme Pontiff, that he may himself restore the True Mass.

3. The petition for all bishops and priests, that God may grant them the grace to "fulfill their ministries" (2 Tim. 4:5).

4. The revival of love for Holy Mother Church among all its members, the calling of young Catholics back to The Faith, the conversion of all men (especially Jews), the liberation of all nations and peoples from slavery and despotism, the restitution of all lands and possessions to their rightful owners, the healing of all wounds, and the magnanimous assistance of all "Christ's poor."

When Mass cannot be attended, you must pray the Rosary. While the Rosary is in no sense a substitute for the Mass, or any of the other sacraments—an error that is disturbingly widespread these days—it is well-known that God has given the deliverance of our age from its present desolation into the hands of Our Lady of Fatima, under the title of the Immaculate Heart. It is she who will triumph in the end over the forces of the Revolution, just as she promised.

You should also make it a frequent practice to read the prayers of the missal. If you are completely deprived of the Mass, this devotion will help you not to lose all familiarity with it. More important, these prayers are in every way perfect and most pleasing to God. They may be taken individually and made the subject of meditations. On Sundays and holydays, reading all the prayers which faithful priests in their various nooks and crannies are saying at the altar is a most excellent thing. Such devotions, admittedly, may leave your heart heavy,

but will prove very beneficial for the soul. Offer your desolation for Catholics behind the Iron Curtain who must do the same thing.

To the foregoing I must add two further notes:

First: Over the past few years there have been many attempts to win official permission for the retention of the "Tridentine Mass" as a kindness to those who prefer it to the great Forgery. Letters of petition have been drafted, long lists of names have been compiled, even impressive marches have been held in Rome. There is no doubt that those who have promoted and assisted these efforts have had the best of intentions and have achieved some good results. In my humble opinion, these fervent and generous souls seem to have shot wide of the mark. For one thing, Pope Paul VI is not going to yield to these requests in a spirit of kindness. He thinks it is an act of greatest kindness on his part to have attempted to rid the Church of the traditional Mass. The good purpose served by these popular vociferations is to slow down, somewhat, the further stages of the Program. Another thing, in case loyal Catholics do not perceive it, they should at least be realistic enough to know that those who are in power understand perfectly that there is a total incompatibility between the unspeakable Affront called the "*Novus Ordo*" and the beauteous Catholic Mass. The authorities know perfectly well what these "Latinists" are driving at, namely, to prove that the faithful prefer the True Mass. There is no need to prove this to these tyrants. Furthermore, the idea of making pitiful entreaties for the merest crumb of what is already perpetually ours only serves to make us appear contemptible. But the basic mistake these petitioners are making is this: *They are much more concerned with their own privation than with the glory of God*. The implication of their argument is, 'If you will allow us to have the Tridentine Mass, we will cease to bother you. We

will learn to live with the "*Novus Ordo*" and make no objection to its performance in our churches.' Apparently these people are unconcerned about the insolent dishonor which this damnable Play-mass flings into the Face of God the All-perfect. If they do not, they ought to know very well that the "New Mass" is not Catholic, that it is expressive of an anti-religion.

Let us have no more of this unworthy compromise and this groveling obsequiousness. Whether you write or speak or march, this must be your insistent and indignant demand: "AWAY WITH THE GREAT FRAUD! WE WILL BE CATHOLIC! WE WILL HAVE OUR MASS! We will no longer abide the base profanation of our churches, nor the unholy pantomiming of the all-holy Sacrifice!" To compromise with the usurpers and ravishers of the Holy Church is against every Catholic virtue. It is to come to terms with Christ's tormentors. Those who have undertaken the praiseworthy labor of restoring the Mass must remember the words of St. Paul:

> *Bear not the yoke with unbelievers. For what participation hath justice with injustice? Or what fellowship hath light with darkness?*
>
> *And what concord hath Christ with Belial? Or what part hath the faithful with the unbeliever?*
>
> 2 Corinthians 6:14–15

Second, I urge all to make it their private apostolate to get a copy of this book into the hands of as many priests (and bishops) as they can. I would hope that the reasons are obvious. Every priest must be given a chance to decide whether he will choose Christ or Baal. If he cannot refute the contentions made here, particularly those which pertain to the

liceity of the "New Mass," he knows he is bound to desist immediately from "saying" it.

If, after having had an opportunity to acquaint himself with the moral alternatives involved in this matter, he chooses to profess the "New Religion," "let him be to thee as the heathen and publican" (Mt. 18:17). But if he thinks he can refute these contentions point-for-point, then he has an obligation in justice to do so either in writing, or to accept my challenge to debate him, which I shall offer presently. His obligation derives from the necessity of defending the "New Mass" as all that it is supposed to be and of thereby stopping the circulation of this incendiary little missile.

Chapter Seven

Challenge

And Elias said again to the people: I only remain a prophet of the Lord; but the prophets of Baal are four hundred and fifty men.

Let two bullocks be given us, and let them choose one bullock for themselves, and cut it in pieces and lay it upon wood, but put no fire under; and I will dress the other bullock, and lay it on wood, and put no fire under it.

Call ye on the names of your gods, and I will call on the name of my Lord; and the God that shall answer by fire, let him be God. And all the people answering said: A very good proposal.

3 Kings 18:22–24

It seems that my present situation is very similar to that of the thaumaturgic prophet Elias (c. 850 B.C.) when the Lord God sent him to challenge King Achaz and to humble and rout the numerous prophets of Baal. During those days, as in these, the people, in obedience to the commands of their divinely-chosen king, had allowed themselves to be seduced into idolatry. The wonderful account of the episode in the third book of Kings makes it very clear that Elias found the false priests of Baal very easy to deal with, despite their great numbers. The reason was, of course, their god was no god at all. My case is the very same. Though literally

thousands of priests have gone over to the worship of Baal ("The people is Baal"), standing against them is the merest child's play. This is not because the modern Baal is no god either, and his "mass" is no more than idol-worship. And since, as the reader can easily see, Baal's well-bleached clerics have no defense for their craven treachery, it takes no courage to challenge them, one and all.

Statements made in this acrid little tract are of sufficient importance to create a great controversy and one of such moral relevance as to rasp the conscience of every man who glories in his priesthood. The whole Catholic world is visibly and painfully torn asunder by the question of the so-called "New Mass." The sooner those who truly love God acknowledge the burning immediacy of this question, the sooner will we find a solution to it, and begin anew to worship Him worthily.

I propose that this controversy be carried on differently from the way the conspirators have proceeded in their ruthless "re-making" of the Church. Instead of pushing out of the way everyone who may disagree with my thesis, that the "New Mass" is nothing but a wicked Hoax, I offer to debate any of Baal's ministers. I challenge any priest to defend his new "faith," his fancy new "mass," and his abandonment of the Faith of the Apostles. Christian chivalry requires that I offer the thousands of ecclesiastical parasites, who now prey on the helpless Catholic faithful, an opportunity to respond to my admittedly harsh accusations and stern demands. Surely, many of them will feel duty-bound to rush to the defense of their spiritual Father and mine, Pope Paul VI, and I should surely hope that every one of them is able to make more sense out of the "Comedy of Errors" known as the "*Novus Ordo*" than I have been able to do here. Besides this, every priest is going to have to be able to refute my dangerous contention that attendance at the "New Mass" is grievously sinful, for,

hopefully, this book will no sooner be on the market than people everywhere will be knocking on the doors of their parish rectories demanding a clear and unequivocal proof that such is not the case. Anyone can figure out that if people stop coming to the local Meal-service, those poaching "presbyters" will be in immediate danger of having to find some kind of *honest* employment.

These erstwhile priests claim to be the exponents of the glorious, freshly refurbished Catholic Faith, the stalwart defenders of the divinely-ordained papacy, and the shepherds of God's people. *I say that any priest who has accepted the new-fangled "mass" is an idolater, a fraud, and a coward, and I challenge him to meet me in verbal combat and to try to prove me wrong.*

What I wish to do now is to name the conditions of our confrontation, determine exactly the subject of our discussion, and (also in the tradition of Christian chivalry) offer as much assistance as I can to any prospective combatant, in consideration of his being the decided underdog.

It seems only proper that you have to face me with people in attendance, Father. The people have been treated as such ignoramuses since the very beginning of your "renewal" of Catholicism. You and your comrades have been insisting that all your Revolutionizing was "for the people," that all these "changes" were an effort to "accommodate" the Mass to the "needs" of the people. Well, now let us just see if you can prove your thesis, with me as your antagonist. Let us submit our arguments to the people and allow them to say which faith they recognize as their own, yours or mine?

We shall hold our debate, Father, after the fashion of the Scholastic disputations of old, in which matters were discussed and decided on the basis of cold logic and carefully-framed syllogisms. Therefore, you must leave all your trite slogans,

catch-phrases, and empty rhetoric at home. You may bring all the documents you want, and so may I. You may have one adviser only. Bring all the friends you wish, provided that they are able to act like Christian ladies and gentlemen; the issues to be treated are too serious to be decided by hecklers and rooters.

Let me caution you, Father, that you should look before you leap. You must not accept my challenge too hastily, lest you "bite off more than you can chew." I must warn you ahead of time that you will have a most difficult task, not because I am such a fearsome dialectician (Heavens no!), but because, whether you know it or not, you are already not only weaponless, but also naked to my sword. Remember, at our meeting, you will not have your bishop to lay the blame to, nor your parish council to give you the votes you will need.

Let it be understood, Father, that in our debate, you will have the role of the defender, I the challenger. Please note well the implied distinction. This means, first of all, that it will not be my place to defend the Catholic Faith against you. Neither should I have to prove to you the holiness of the Catholic Mass. Nor will we need to go into a discussion as to whether the Mass can be changed licitly in some of its rubrics; or whether there is presently a need for such a reform. We will not be talking at all about the True Mass, but about that "mass" which you now claim for your own.

Nor will we begin to argue the fundamentals of the Faith, such as the doctrine of the Primacy of the Pope, or that of papal infallibility. If you do not accept these notions as basic, you and I can never debate any question which pertains to Catholic theology. One more thing: should you and I engage in a verbal face-off, I beg you not to plan to divert me with protestations of loyalty to the Holy Father—we preach no schism here! It seems necessary to remind everyone that the

pope does not own either you or me, or the Church. There are limits even to his authority.

The general subject of our debate will be the contents of this book, specifically the question, "Why the 'New Mass'?" As the defender, you must be able to refute the main contentions made in this writing. They are as follows:

1. The "New Mass" is no Mass at all. It is rather a deceitful and perverse Mimicry of the True Mass. It is therefore a most horrible Sacrilege, the malicious Hoax of the anti-Christian Revolution.

2. Pope Paul VI deserves the lion's share of the blame for introducing this obscene Exhibition.

3. Despite all that Pope Paul and the bishops of the Church have done to suggest the opposite, all the laws of the Church which were established to support and perpetuate the True Mass are still in effect. Pope Paul's decree *Missale Romanum,* which purports to invalidate these laws, is in itself null and void.

4. Regardless of the question of the legality of the "New Mass" or of its validity, every priest who has abandoned the True Mass and accepted it, and the anti-religion to which it gives witness, has violated his priestly Oath; he is therefore in the state of sin, whether he admits it or not. Each time he goes to the Table to perform his new "rites" he commits two more sins, one of sacrilege and another of perjury.

5. Attendance at the "New Mass" on the part of lay people is a mortal sin; it is participation in an act of idolatry.

These are my contentions, Father, asserted in bold and unmistakable terms for your easy annihilation. You see the advantages I offer you; my words would suggest that I am altogether mad. One thing is most clear: we have something to argue about.

But the question remains: wild as my words are, can you prove them wrong? Would it not be a frightful thing if you could not, you who "say" this Mock-mass? With a few simple sentences, chosen perhaps from the writings of the Fathers of the Church, or St. Thomas Aquinas, or the decrees of one of the Ecumenical Councils, you should be able to make a perfect fool of me, and expose me to well-deserved ignominy. One would think that all you priests of Baal would jump at the chance to give me a good verbal drubbing for making such outrageous statements. I said above that I wish to offer assistance to any of you so inclined. Here I will add a comment or so about each of these propositions, except the last (it being implicitly included in the first), hoping to warn you of certain dialectical obstacles you will encounter.

1. Now, Father, if you deny anything I am saying, you will have a chance to give the straight of it. Of course, if you cannot, it is a natural question to ask why you continue in your present mode of life? Do you have a reason for your priestly existence? You act as if your "New Religion" is the Old Religion, true Catholicism. Can you prove it? You say your "New Mass" is essentially the same as the Old Mass; an easy thing to say—Protestant ministers, car salesmen, and Black Panthers say all kinds of things. The question is, can you prove the things you claim against someone whom you cannot command to keep silent, against someone who is not afraid of your angry voice and your fierce threats, against someone who knows something of what the official documents of the Church say?

In all fairness to you, Father, I have to warn you that, before you come to our joust, be sure to study the "New Mass" very carefully. There are many aspects of it which I have found it necessary, in the interest of brevity, to omit in this writing. But you would be at an even greater disadvantage if you were not very familiar with the subject. Let me give you a further warning while on this point: you will have to do all your reference work on the "New Mass" from the *Novus Ordo Missae* itself, since, to my knowledge, there are no theological treatises on the vacuous Thing—which in itself is an interesting point. One would think that at the appearance of a brand new "mass" in the Church, there would be a veritable avalanche of exciting, scholarly treatises on it, which expound its profound spirituality, its mystical insights, its doctrinal subtleties. After all, is not the "*Novus Ordo*" the glorious modern master-work of the Spirit of God? Logically, you should not lack books to do your research in, Father, but, just between you and me, can you give me the title of just one such book? The only thing to be done, of course, is for you to write a book yourself. Call it, "*The Holiness of the 'New Mass'.*" You should find a ready market for it. To date, the only books to be found on this subject busy themselves with explaining the relationship of the "New Mass" to the people, and the wonderful advantages they now enjoy from it (but which they have yet to discover). Not surprisingly, these books have had a rather thin readership.

Surely you, Father, would not be "saying" the so-called "New Mass," if you could not defeat me on every point. Other priests may have accepted the order to abandon the True Mass out of blind and slavish obedience and may have never seriously considered the gravity of their action, but *you* are not so careless as that. It was only after long and assiduous investigation that you made your decision. And when you did,

it was on the basis of the easily proved fact that, by golly, this "New Mass" is definitely superior in every respect to the Old One! Neither did you begin to "say" it in fear, but out of a sense of devotion to Christ, Our Blessed Savior, for Whom you would gladly die, were He to ask it. Had you not been certain that it was the Divine Will commanding you to accept these strange new forms, and not merely conniving, fallible men, you would never have taken such a momentous and undreamed-of step. Surely there is not the faintest possibility of any truth in my assertions against this atrocious Concoction, and you can prove this without the least difficulty.

It is obvious that I do not know what the "New Mass" is all about, and that you do, because after all you "say" it every day. No doubt, Father, you can explain perfectly well why and how you came to take up the "New Religion" with its mocking Prayer-Game. You had a holy purpose in forcing the people in our charge to accept it, despite their misgivings. You told them that they could trust you and the bishops and the pope; you would take full responsibility for any mistakes involved. When we have our encounter, Father, we shall be speaking about why you have done what you have; it will be unavoidable. You were and are a free man. No doubt you can give a good reason why, all of a sudden, you changed your religion, even while you kept protesting you were not doing so, and no doubt you would be proud to stand before anyone and bear witness to the fact. Surely you began to change your way of saying Mass, not because you *had* to, but because a new light had dawned in your life. Your thinking had become so thoroughly altered that you were glad to be done with the detestable Mass of the Apostles and to take up the marvelous "*Novus Ordo*." But, more to the point, Father, were we to meet head-on, you would have to know what the "theology" of the "New Mass" is; to say it better, you would

have to be able to prove that it has such. Now this will challenge your ingenuity.

In your defense of your new-fangled "mass," you will have to whip up a good explanation for the trends which have developed as a result of it. Such an epochal thing is the introduction of a brand new "mass," so inspired as it is said to be, one would think the whole Church would be enjoying during these days a wondrous revival of fervor, a veritable "second spring" of spiritual vitality. There should be huge ordination classes; the seminaries should be bulging with priestly aspirants; the monasteries and convents should be multiplying in every quarter; every parish church should require more, not fewer, Masses; there should be holy hours, novenas, all-night vigils, and every other devotion to the Blessed Sacrament, this in ever-increasing numbers. In view of all that was claimed for the "New Mass," and in view of how urgently and ruthlessly it was imposed upon us, we should expect the people to be attending the "New Mass" daily in great hordes. But, one cannot help observing that none of these things has happened, but the very opposite. One does not hear that priests must be granted the privilege of offering as many as *four* Masses on Sundays; oh no! It seems that many priests are going through what is called a "crisis of identity." Poor fellows, they don't know what they are, priests, or "presidents," "presbyters," or what. And the only thing that will get them out of the confusion is for them to get married. And, as if to avoid some kind of plague, priests are running away, leaving to get married, escaping into retirement, taking up "social work," going to prison (for a more honest form of Revolutionism than their comrades in the parishes and other places), going to mental hospitals. Due to the "New Mass," the faithful are glad enough to go and watch the tiresome Thing on Saturday to avoid having it ruin their Sunday. These trends

are not really to be blamed on the "New Mass," are they, Father? Shall we blame them on the War in Vietnam? How about the "Military-Industrial Complex?"

Will you deny that the Second Vatican Council and its deformed "Brain-child," the "New Mass," have caused a general decline in the moral tenor of the Catholic people? Worse and more symptomatic, they have been largely responsible for the near stoppage in what should be considered the natural and normal growth of the Church. This growth is measured by three statistics: the number of births in Catholic families, the number of vocations to the religious life, and the number of conversions to the Faith. Many married people no longer believe in having children; the truth is, they no longer *love* children. (Let me hear nothing about the number of children which fulfills the obligation of marriage; every child is a gift of God [Ps. 126:3].) Priests have nothing to convert non-believers to. Their main business is subverting believers, and keeping them subverted. Finally, those in religion do not inspire enough vocations to keep their communities alive, much less increase their numbers. In fact, those who imagine themselves called to religion are looked upon with pity by the laity, for it is certain that after a few months in the seminaries and convents, they will have become embittered rebels, and, in many cases, ferocious Revolutionaries, hating their own heritage, defiant of all authority, and an unbearable disgrace to their heart-broken parents. I do not hesitate to forbid parents from allowing their children to go to those schools of Satan where the "New Religion" is taught, though, of course, I need not mention this since at such places the True Mass is not available. This sterility is certain proof for my contention that the "New Religion" and its impious Song-and-dance are *self*-worship. They breed nothing but selfishness and pride

and an ugly, warped, and reprobate spirit, which despises and contends against Nature and Grace.

On the subject of the "New Mass" itself, Father, I shall expect you to clear up my tender-souled scruples over its questionable validity. But, much more, there will be the necessity of a perfect reconciliation between the "theology" of the "New Mass" and the doctrines of the Church. I have particular reference to the decrees of the Council of Trent and its outspoken Catechism. Also, it will not be too much to ask you to elucidate the hidden harmony between the "*Novus Ordo*" and the clarion encyclicals of Pope Pius XII, *Mystici Corporis*, *Humani Generis*, and *Mediator Dei.* To my stunted brain, the "New Religion" and its insipid Side-show stand in diametric opposition to all three of these, and to the teachings generally of this Pope. You will help me, won't you, Father? But I will want to know even more than this: If I am to "say" the "New Mass," I will have to be relieved of my prejudice against its purposeful mistranslations, its Revolutionary tonalties, and its pasted-together ritual.

2. I must warm you in advance, Father, that you must not defend the "New Mass" too ardently, else you will find yourself on the horns of an unmanageable dilemma. For, the more you make of the "New Mass," the more you will embarrass Pope Paul VI, who apparently has almost no regard for it at all. It is my oft-repeated accusation that upon him is the main responsibility for the unfunny Trick which this unholy Concatenation is. Ever since its appearance, it has been the setting for the anti-religious cavortings of certain of the clergy and lay people, and the audio-visual aid for the corruption of the young. Will you be able to explain why Pope Paul has proved utterly ineffective in putting a stop to these desecrations, Father—he who has proved himself so masterful in driving the True Mass from the churches? Yes, I know,

Father, you will try to tell me that the Pontiff has condemned these irreverences, has even been known to weep over them publicly. You are easily deceived, Father, They are crocodile tears; it is an act. How could he, the Father of the people, expect his children to know how to behave at the "New Mass" when its very existence is a symbol of his own disregard for the True Mass and for all tradition and law? Once he "abrogated" the laws of the Church which were enacted to establish and protect the liturgy from abuse, how could he seriously expect his own "liturgy" to be immune from the same treatment, or worse? Of course he did not expect it to be, and he does not really mind that it is not. And you should have noticed, Father, that Pope Paul pauses amid his tears to appoint bishops whose most conspicuous qualifications for the episcopacy are their non-descriptness, accompanied by a positive loathing for anything which faintly resembles Orthodoxy. His making these nonentities bishops is a sure way of guaranteeing what unfailingly happens: no sooner do they arrive in their new dioceses than they set about bringing ruin to whatever has survived of recognizable Catholicism. This has happened too frequently to be accidental. But I am sure you will be able to give such phenomena a less distressing interpretation when we meet. Still, it would seem a wiser thing for you to let the Pope look to his own defense, Father. You will have all you can do to justify your own infidelity.

3. Every priest who has accepted the "New Mass" has done so on the presumption of the validity of Pope Paul VI's Apostolic Constitution, *Missale Romanum*. Whether you have ever thought about it or not, Father, this decree is the only thing which stands between you and all the documents of the Church which concern the True Mass. These documents are ratifications of the Apostolic Constitution of Pope St. Pius V entitled *Quo Primum*. Therefore, such a person as yourself can

justify "saying" the "New Mass" provided *a)* that it does not embody a *substantial* change in the Mass, as the Pope and all his underlings pretend; *b)* that obedience to the "decree" *Missale Romanum* is morally permissible; *c)* that this "decree" which enacts the changes in the Mass is licit; and *d)* that this "decree" is valid.

I challenge you to prove even one of these provisos, Father. And since you cannot do so, by what right do you ignore the Church's legislation concerning the sacred liturgy? Permit me to ask you a very blunt question: Have you gotten to the point where you let yourself be commanded to do anything, regardless of the morality of the command? I say you have. And it is to be expected. For your moral insensitivity is only another of the sedative effects both of your present acclimation to the stench of the Revolutionary creed and of your own habituation to the state of sin.

It is inconceivable that Pope Paul did not have his reasons for bringing forth a clearly invalid law. No matter what his reasons were, the results are undeniable. The most obvious and worst one is the seeming abrogation of all laws which govern the liturgy, without putting any in their place. We are all the witnesses of the consequences, a state of liturgical anarchy. Such a procedure is in perfect accord with the overall policy of the present pontificate, which is to promote the "New Religion," or, if you will, the anti-religion of the all-destroying Revolution. Now, Father, you needn't act so shocked at hearing such strong words; you are an accomplice in this entire Program. Are you not taking advantage of this pseudo-legislation called *Missale Romanum* to cover up your own less newsworthy persecution of the Man of Sorrows?

4. Even should you have been able to fend off all blows till this phase of our debate, Father, you would not be out of the woods yet. We would still have to discuss your

curious ethics. You yourself are quite a moral question mark, you know, to simpletons like me. Tell me, what is your route around your priestly Oath? Yes, I see that you are going along whistlingly as if there were no problem. What I want to know is, when were you dispensed from this Oath, by whom, and by what legality was this dispensation accomplished? The Profession of Faith is intimately related to the doctrines of the Council of Trent and the "Tridentine Mass." The "New Mass" has no affinity, either doctrinal or liturgical, with that council. Since you perpetrate this sacrilegious Insult daily, if not oftener, you could not be unaware of the fact. It appears to me that, on your own steam, you have nicely commuted your Oath. How does one go about such a thing, indelicate though it is for me to ask? Everyone knows that in the "New Order" to follow one's conscience is the "way to go"—whether to Heaven or to Hell (well, we shall not trouble ourselves with details). Still, it seems a curious thing to see a usually honest fellow like yourself so alter your priestly Oath that it now binds you to a "new faith" and allows you to perform the Great Sacrilege, for no other reason than the good pleasure of the Pope.

Theoretically at least, everyone of the priests of Baal should be able and willing to take up cudgels against me. There should be such a great number of them, that they should have to cast lots or draw for high card or something to see which one should come and make an end of me. Everyone of them should recognize that his own condition requires he should be able to parry every single one of my thrusts, for, if he cannot do so, he is in deep trouble. Further, for the sake of the people, all my theses are going to have to be answered, and that pretty quickly, for the longer they are allowed to float around freely, the wider

their circulation will grow. If these pastors of souls have any care of their flocks, they will recognize the threat this present sally portends. Through it, horror of horrors, many of their pied followers could be drawn away and find the path back to Catholicism.

Chapter Eight

Conclusion

And Elias said to them: Take the prophets of Baal, and let not one of them escape. And when they had taken them, Elias brought them down to the torrent Cison, and killed them there.

And Elias said to Achab: Go up, eat, and drink; for there is a sound of abundance of rain.

Achab went up to eat and drink; and Elias went up to the top of Carmel, and casting himself down upon the earth put his face between his knees.

And he said to his servant: Go up, and look toward the sea. And he went up, and looked, and said: There is nothing. And again he said to him: Return seven times.

And at the seventh time, behold, a little cloud arose out of the sea like a man's foot. And he said: Go up and say to Achab: Prepare thy chariot and go down, lest the rain prevent thee.

And while he turned himself this way and that way, behold the Heavens grew dark, with clouds, and wind, and there fell a great rain.

3 Kings 18:40–45

Having foolishly tasted, we Catholics are all able to testify, "The 'Old' is better." It is already past the time when this tasteless Concoction of a "mass" should have been sent back to the kitchen as unfit for *human* consumption;

whereas, we are "a chosen generation, a kingly priesthood, a holy nation, a purchased people" (1 Pet. 2:9). We require more than a light lunch; we must have Food that has been sacrificed, the Bread of Angels, the "strong meat" (Heb. 5:12) of Christ's own Flesh, and the "milk without guile" (1 Pet. 2:2), the Blood which flows from the Side of Resurrected One.

For we have great chores to do, and a glorious battle to wage: "Our wrestling is not against flesh and blood, but against principalities and powers, against the rulers of the world of this darkness, against the spirits of wickedness in the high places" (Eph. 6:12). It is time we dealt with the meddlesome interlopers in our midst, who, while we were asleep, have sown "the execrable cockle of error and schism"[77] in the field of Christ's Church (Mt. 13:25). It is time we united our forces against the modern-day barbarians who are bent on the ruination and befouling of every divine and human construction. It is time for a rebirth of charity among those of the "household of the faith" (Gal. 6:10), that others, who are wandering in the darkness, may see our good works, which that Faith inspires inexhaustibly. It is time to glorify our Father Who is in Heaven (Mt. 5:16)—blessed be His Name forever!

Any Catholic should see there will never be any peace or order in the Church or in the world at large unless there occur a restoration of the True Mass and the Ancient Faith. If this prospect disturbs outsiders, so be it. We have our souls to save, as well as theirs, and we cannot achieve this without our Mass.

November 1, 1971
The Feast of All Saints

[77] *Enchiridon Symbolorum*. Cc. Trid. Sess. XIII. Prooemium. P. 384, No. 1635.

Appendix I

Apostolic Constitution of Pope Pius V, 1570 *Quo Primum*

[Note: The following is an English translation of the Apostolic Constitution "Quo Primum" promulgated in 1570 by Pope St. Pius V ordering the use of the Tridentine Mass for all future time. It appeared in Latin in every official Altar Missal from 1570 until the recent changes were instituted, then it was conveniently dropped.]

"From the very first, upon Our elevation to the chief Apostleship, We gladly turned our mind and energies and directed all our thoughts to those matters which concerned the preservation of a pure liturgy, and We strove with God's help, by every means in our power, to accomplish this purpose.

For, besides other decrees of the sacred Council of Trent, there were stipulations for Us to revise and re-edit the sacred books: the Catechism, the Missal, and the Breviary. With the Catechism published for the instruction of the faithful, by God's help, and the Breviary thoroughly revised for the worthy praise of God, in order that the Missal and Breviary may be in perfect harmony, as in fitting and proper—for it is most

becoming that there be in the Church only one appropriate manner of reciting the Psalms and only one rite for the celebration of Mass—We deemed it necessary to give our immediate attention to what still remained to be done, viz., the re-editing of the Missal as soon as possible.

Hence, we decided to entrust this work to learned men of our selection. They very carefully collated all their work with the ancient codices in Our Vatican Library and with reliable, preserved or emended codices from elsewhere. Besides this, these men consulted the works of ancient and approved authors concerning the same sacred rites; and thus they have restored the Missal itself to the original form and rite of the holy Fathers. When this work had been gone over numerous times and further emended, after serious study and reflection, We commanded that the finished product be printed and published as soon as possible, so that all might enjoy the fruits of this labor; and thus, priests would know which prayers to use and which rites and ceremonies they were required to observe from now on in the celebration of Masses.

Let all everywhere adopt and observe what has been handed down by the Holy Roman Church, the Mother and Teacher of the other churches, and let Masses not be sung or read according to any other formula than that of this Missal published by Us. This ordinance applies henceforth, now, and forever, throughout all the provinces of the Christian world, to all patriarchates, cathedral churches, collegiate and parish churches, be they secular or religious, both of men and of women—even of military orders—and of churches or chapels without a specific congregation in which conventual Masses are sung aloud in choir or read privately in accord with the rites and customs of the Roman Church. This Missal is to be used by all churches, even those which in their authorization are made exempt, whether by Apostolic indult, custom, or

privilege, or even if by oath or official confirmation of the Holy See, or have their rights and faculties guaranteed to them by any other manner whatsoever.

This new rite alone is to be used unless approval of the practice of saying Mass differently was given at the very time of the institution and confirmation of the church by the Apostolic See at least 200 years ago, or unless there has prevailed a custom of a similar kind which has been continuously followed for a period of not less then 200 years, in which cases We in no wise rescind their above-mentioned prerogative or custom. However, if this Missal, which we have seen fit to publish, be more agreeable to these latter, We grant them permission to celebrate Mass according to its rite, provided they have the consent of their bishop or prelate or of their whole Chapter, everything else to the contrary notwithstanding

All other of the churches referred to above, however, are hereby denied the use of the other missals, which are to be discontinued entirely and absolutely; whereas, by this present Constitution, which will be valid henceforth, now, and forever, We order and enjoin that nothing must be added to Our recently published Missal, nothing omitted from it, nor anything whatsoever be changed within it under the penalty of Our displeasure.

We specifically command each and every patriarch, administrator, and all other persons of whatever ecclesiastical dignity they may be, be they even cardinals of the Holy Roman Church, or possessed of any other rank or pre-eminence, and We order them in virtue of holy obedience to chant or to read the Mass according to the rite and manner and norm herewith laid down by Us and, hereafter, to discontinue and completely discard all other rubrics and rites of other missals, however ancient, which they have customarily followed; and they must

not in celebrating Mass presume to introduce any ceremonies or recite any prayers other than those contained in this Missal.

Furthermore, by these presents [this law], in virtue of Our Apostolic authority, We grant and concede in perpetuity that, for the chanting or reading of the Mass in any church whatsoever, this Missal is hereafter to be followed absolutely, without any scruple of conscience or fear of incurring any penalty, judgment, or censure, and may freely and lawfully be used. Nor are superiors, administrators, canons, chaplains, and other secular priests, or religious, or whatever order or by whatever title designated, obliged to celebrate Mass otherwise than as enjoined by Us. We likewise declare and ordain that no one whosoever is to be forced or coerced to alter this Missal, and that this present document cannot be revoked or modified, but remain always valid and retain its full force—notwithstanding the previous constitutions and decrees of the Holy See, as well as any general or special constitutions or edicts of provincial or synodal councils, and notwithstanding the practice and custom of the aforesaid churches, established by long and immemorial prescription—except, however, if of more than two hundred years' standing.

It is Our will, therefore, and by the same authority, We decree that after we publish this constitution and the edition of this Missal, the priests of the Roman curia are, after thirty days, obliged to chant or read the Mass according to it; all others south of the Alps, after three months; and those beyond the Alps either within six months or whenever the Missal is available for sale. Wherefore, in order that the Missal be preserved incorrupt throughout the whole world and kept free of flaws and errors, the penalty for nonobservance for printers, whether mediately or immediately subject to Our dominion, and that of the Holy Roman Church, will be the forfeiting of their books and a fine of one hundred gold ducats, payable *ipso*

facto to the Apostolic Treasury. Further, as for those located in other parts of the world, the penalty is excommunication *latae sententiae* [i.e., imposed by an ecclesiastical tribunal], in such other penalties as may in Our judgment be imposed; and we decree by this law that they must not dare or presume either to print or to publish or to sell or in any way to accept books of this nature without Our approval and consent, or without the expressed consent of the Apostolic Commissaries of those places, who will be appointed by Us. Said printer must receive a standard Missal from the aforementioned Apostolic Commissary to serve as a model for subsequent copies, which, when made, must be compared with the standard Missal and agree faithfully with it and in no wise vary from the Roman Missal of the large type (*secundum magnam impressionem).*

Accordingly since it would be difficult for this present pronouncement to be sent to all parts of the Christian world and simultaneously come to light everywhere, We direct that it be, as usual, posted and published at the doors of the Basilica of the Prince of the Apostles, also at the Apostolic Chancery, and on the street at Campo Flora; furthermore We direct that printed copies of this same edict signed by a notary public and made official by an ecclesiastical dignitary possess the same indubitable validity everywhere and in every nation, as if Our manuscript were shown there. Therefore, no one whosoever is permitted to alter this letter or heedlessly to venture to go contrary to this notice of Our permission, statute, ordinance, command, precept, grant, indult, declaration, will, decree, and prohibition. Should anyone, however, presume to commit such an act, he should know that he will incur the wrath of Almighty God and of the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul.

Given at St. Peter's in the year of the Lord's Incarnation, 1570, on the 14th of July of the fifth year of Our Pontificate.

Appendix II

Apostolic Constitution of Pope Paul VI, 1969 *Missale Romanum*

Which promulgates the Roman Missal
restored by decree of the
Second Vatican Ecumenical Council
PAUL, BISHOP
Servant of the Servants of God
For Everlasting Memory

1. The Roman Missal, promulgated in 1570 by our predecessor, St. Pius V, by decree of the Council of Trent,[1] has been received by all as one of the numerous and admirable fruits which the holy Council has spread throughout the entire Church of Christ. For four centuries, not only has it furnished the priests of the Latin Rite with the norms for the celebration of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, but also the saintly heralds of the Gospel have carried it almost to the entire world. Furthermore, innumerable holy men have abundantly nourished their piety towards God by its readings from sacred Scripture or by its

[1] CF Apost. Const. *Quo Primum*, July 13, 1570.

prayers whose general arrangement goes back, in essence, to St. Gregory the Great.

2. Since that time there has grown and spread among the Christian people the liturgical renewal which, according to Pius XII, our predecessor of venerable memory, seems to show the signs of God's providence in the present time, a salvific action of the Holy Spirit in His Church.[2] This renewal has also shown clearly that the formulas of the Roman Missal ought to be revised and enriched. The beginning of this renewal was the work of our predecessor, this same Pius XII, in the restoration of the Paschal Vigil and of the Holy Week Rite,[3] which formed the first stage of updating the Roman Missal for the present-day mentality.

3. The recent Second Vatican Ecumenical Council, in promulgating the Constitution *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, established the bases for the general revision of the Roman Missal: in declaring that "both texts and rites should be drawn up so that they express more clearly the holy things which they signify;"[4] in ordering that "the rite of the Mass is to be revised in such a way that the intrinsic nature and purpose of its several parts, as also the connection between them, can be more clearly manifested, and that devout and active participation by the faithful can be more easily accomplished:"[5] in prescribing that "the treasures of the Bible are to be opened up more lavishly, so that richer fare may be provided for the faithful at the table of God's

[2] Cf. Pius XII. Discourse to the participants of the First International Congress of Pastoral Liturgy at Assisi, May 22, 1956: A.A. S. 48 (1956) 712.

[3] Cf. Sacred Congregation of Rites Decree *Dominicae Resurrectionis*, February 9, 1951; A.A. S. 43 (1951) 138 ff: Decree *Maxima Redemptionis nostrae mysteria*, November 16, 1955: A.A.S. 47 (1955) 838ff.

[4] II Vatican Council, , Const. On the Sacred Liturgy, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, art. 21: A.A.S. 56 (1964) 114.

[5] Ibid, art. 50 A.A.S. 56 (1964) 114.

Word;"[6] ordering, finally, that "a new rite for concelebration is to be drawn up and incorporated into the Pontifical and into the Roman Missal."[7]

4. One ought not to think, however, that this revision of the Roman Missal has been improvident. The progress that the liturgical sciences have accomplished in the last four centuries has, without a doubt, prepared the way. After the Council of Trent, the study "of ancient manuscripts of the Vatican library and of others gathered elsewhere," as our predecessor St. Pius V indicates in the Apostolic Constitution *Quo Primum*, has greatly helped for the revision of the Roman Missal. Since then, however, more ancient liturgical sources have been discovered and published and at the same time liturgical formulas of the Oriental Church have become better known. Many wish that the riches, both doctrinal and spiritual, might not be hidden in the darkness of the libraries, but on the contrary might be brought into the light to illumine and nourish the spirits and souls of Christians.

5. Let us show now, in broad lines, the new composition of the Roman Missal. First of all, in a *General Instruction*, which serves as a preface for the book, the new regulations are set forth for the celebration of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, concerning the rites and functions of each of the participants and sacred furnishings and places.

6. The major innovation concerns the Eucharistic Prayer. If in the Roman Rite, the first part of this Prayer, the *Preface*, has preserved diverse formulation in the course of the centuries, the second part on the contrary, called "Canon of the Action," took on an unchangeable form during the 4th and 5th centuries; conversely, the Eastern liturgies allowed for this variety in their *anaphoras*. In this matter, however, apart from the fact that the

[6] Ibid. art. 51: A.A.S. 56 (1964) 114.

[7] Ibid, art. 57: A.A.S. 56 (1964) 115.

Eucharistic Prayer is enriched by a great number of Prefaces, either derived from the ancient tradition of the Roman Church or composed recently, we have decided to add three new Canons to this Prayer. In this they will procure richer themes for the thanksgiving. However, for pastoral reasons, and in order to facilitate concelebration, we have ordered that the words of the Lord ought to be identical in each formulary of the Canon. Thus, in each Eucharistic Prayer, we wish that the words he pronounced thus: over the bread: *Accipite et manducate ex hoc omnes: Hoc est enim Corpus meum, quod pro vobis treadetur*; over the chalice: *Accipite et bibite ex eo omnes: Hic est enim calix Sanguinis mei novi et aeterni testamenti, qui pro vobis ex pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum. Hoc facite in meam commemorationem*. The words *Mysterium Fidei*, taken from the context of the words of Christ the Lord, and said by the priest, serve as an introduction to the acclamation of the faithful.

7. Concerning the rite of the Mass, "the rites are to be simplified, while due care is taken to preserve their substance."[8] Also to be eliminated are "elements which, with the passage of time, came to be duplicated, or were added with but little advantage,"[8] above all in the rites of offering the bread and wine, and in those of the breaking of the bread and of communion.

8. Also, "other elements which have suffered injury through accidents of history are now to be restored to the earlier norm of the holy Fathers:"[8] for example the homily,[9] the "common prayer" or "prayer of the faithful,"[10] the penitential rite or act of reconciliation with God and with the brothers, at the beginning of the Mass, where its proper emphasis is restored.

[8] Ibid. art. 50: 11.A.S. 56 (1964) 114.
[9] Cf. Ibid, art. 52: A.A.S. 56 (1964) 114.
[10] Cf. Ibid., art 53: A.A.S. 56 (1964) 114.

9. According to the prescription of the Second Vatican Council which prescribes that "a more representative portion of the Holy Scriptures will be read to the people over a set cycle of years,"[11] all of the readings for Sunday are divided into a cycle of three years. In addition, for Sundays and feasts, the readings of the Epistle and Gospel are preceded by a reading from the Old Testament or, during Paschaltide, from the Acts of the Apostles. In this way the dynamism of the mystery of salvation, shown by the text of divine revelation, is more clearly accentuated. These widely selected biblical readings, which give to the faithful on feast days the most important part of sacred Scripture, is completed by access to the other parts of the Holy Books read on other days.

10. All this is wisely ordered in such a way that there is developed more and more among the faithful a "hunger for the Word of God,"[12] which, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, leads the people of the New Covenant to the perfect unity of the Church. We are fully confident that both priests and faithful will prepare their hearts more devoutly and together at the Lord's Supper, meditating more profoundly on sacred Scripture, and at the same time they will nourish themselves more day by day with the words of the Lord. It will follow then that according to the wishes of the Second Vatican Council, sacred Scripture will be at the same time a perpetual source of spiritual life, an instrument of prime value for transmitting Christian doctrine and finally in the center of all theology.

11. In this revision of the Roman Missal, in addition to the three changes mentioned above, namely, the Eucharistic Prayer, the Rite for the Mass and the Biblical readings, other parts also have been reviewed and considerably modified: the Proper of

[11] Ibid., art. 51: A.A.S. 56 (1964) 114.
[12] Cf. Amos 8, 11.

Seasons, the Proper of Saints, the Common of Saints, ritual Masses and votive Masses. In all of these changes, particular care has been taken with the prayers: not only has their number been increased, so that the new texts might better correspond to new needs, but also their text has been restored on the testimony of the most ancient evidence. For each ferial of the principal liturgical seasons, Advent, Christmas, Lent and Easter, a proper prayer has been provided.

12. Even though the text of the Roman Gradual, at least that which concerns the singing, has not been changed, still, for a better understanding, the responsorial psalm, which St. Augustine and St. Leo the Great often mention, has been restored, and the Introit and Communion antiphons have been adapted for read Masses.

13. In conclusion, we wish to give the force of law to all that we have set forth concerning the new Roman Missal. In promulgating the official edition of the Roman Missal, our predecessor St. Pius V presented it as an instrument of liturgical unity and as a witness to the purity of the worship in the Church. While leaving room in the new Missal, according to the order of the Second Vatican Council, "for legitimate variations and adaptations,"[13] we hope nevertheless that the Missal will be received by the faithful as an instrument which bears witness to and which affirms the common unity of all. Thus, in the great diversity of languages, one unique prayer will rise as an acceptable offering to our Father in Heaven, through our High Priest Jesus Christ, in the Holy Spirit.

14. We order that the prescriptions of this Constitution go into effect November 30th of this year, the first Sunday of Advent.

[13] Cf. Conc. Vat. II, Const. *De Sacra Liturgia, Sacrosanctum Concilium*, nn 36–40; A.A.S. 56 (1964) 110.

15. We wish that these our decrees and prescriptions may be firm and effective now and in the future, notwithstanding, to the extent necessary, the apostolic constitutions and ordinances issued by our predecessors, and other prescriptions, even those deserving particular mention and derogation.

Given at Rome, at St. Peter's, Holy Thursday, April 3, 1969, the sixth year of our pontificate.

PAUL VI, POPE

Appendix III

Profession of the Catholic Faith Taken by all Priests at Ordination

I, N…, believe and profess with firm faith each and every truth which is contained in the Symbol of the Faith (the Nicene Creed) of which the Holy Roman Church makes use, namely:

I believe in one God, the Father almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible. And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God. Born of the Father before all ages, God of God, Light of Light, true God of true God. Begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father: by whom all things were made. Who for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven. And was incarnate by the Holy Spirit of the Virgin Mary; and was made Man. He was crucified also for us; suffered under Pontius Pilate, died, and was buried. And the third day He rose again according to the Scriptures. And He ascended into heaven: He sitteth at the right hand of the Father. And He shall come again with glory to judge both the living and the dead: of whose Kingdom there shall be no end. And I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and

giver of life: who proceedeth from the Father and the Son, Who together with the Father, and the Son is adored, and glorified: who spoke by the Prophets. And in One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church. I confess one baptism for the remission of sins. And I look for the resurrection of the dead. And the life of the world to come. Amen.

I resolutely accept and embrace the traditions of the Apostles and all other traditions of the Church, and all its observances and regulations. Likewise, I accept the sacred Scriptures in that very sense in which Holy Mother Church, whose right is to declare their true sense and meaning, has held them and hold them now; nor will I ever accept or interpret them in a way contrary to the unanimous agreement of the Fathers (of the Church).

Further, I profess that there are seven true and proper sacraments of the New Law, each instituted by Jesus Christ Our Lord for the salvation of the human race (although all of them are not necessary for everyone), namely, Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, (Holy) Orders and Matrimony; that these confer grace and that, of these Baptism, Confirmation and (Holy) Orders cannot be received a second time without sacrilege. Also, I accept and adhere to the rites of the solemn administration of the aforementioned sacraments according as they have been accepted and approved by the Catholic Church. I embrace and accept each and every tenet concerning Original Sin and Justification which was defined and declared by the sacred Council of Trent. I likewise affirm that in the Mass there is offered to God a true, worthy, and expiatory Sacrifice for the living and the dead; and that the Body and Blood of Our Lord Jesus Christ, together with His Soul and Divinity, are really and substantially present in the Most Blessed Sacrament of the Eucharist, and that there occurs a change of the total substance of the bread into His Body and of the total substance of the wine into His Blood, which change the Catholic Church calls

Transubstantiation. I confess also that Christ, whole and entire, and the true sacrament are received under either species.

I firmly hold that there is a Purgatory and that the souls detained there are helped through the prayers of the faithful; similarly, that the saints who reign with Christ are to be venerated and invoked and that they offer their prayers to God for us and, that their relics should be venerated. I firmly assert that images of Christ and of the Mother of God ever Virgin, as well as of the other saints, should be possessed and retained and that they should be shown due honor and veneration. Also I affirm that Christ left the power to grant indulgences to the Church and that these are most useful for the salvation of the Christian people. I acknowledge the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Roman Church to be the mother and teacher of all Churches, and I vow and swear true obedience to the Roman pontiff, the vicar of Jesus Christ and the successor of blessed Peter, the Prince of the Apostles.

Moreover, I maintain and profess, without doubting, all the other teachings handed down, defined, and declared in the sacred canons by the ecumenical councils, especially by the most holy Council of Trent and by the (First) Ecumenical Vatican Council, particularly that of the primacy of the infallible magisterium of the Roman pontiff; and at the same time I condemn, reject, and anathematize all opinions to the contrary and all heresies whatever which the Church condemns, rejects, and anathematizes.

I, N..., promise, vow, and swear that, with God's help, I shall most constantly hold and profess this true Catholic faith, outside which no one can be saved and which I now freely profess and truly hold. With the help of God, I shall profess it whole and unblemished to my dying breath; and, to the best of my ability, I shall see to it that my subjects and those entrusted to me by virtue of my office hold it, teach it, and preach it. So help me God and His holy Gospels.